DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 604 UD 030 371

TITLE	Implementation of the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred Third Congress, Second Session (September 15, 1994).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. House Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-16-046655-5
PUB DATE	95
NOTE	110p.; Serial No. 103-120.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Access to Education; Educational Improvement; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; *Federal Legislation; Government Role; Hearings; *Information Dissemination; Minority Groups
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 103rd; Goals 2000; *Office of Educational Research and Improvement; Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

The House Subcommittee met to consider the progress that had been made toward the implementation of the restructuring of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) and the fulfillment of its original mission, the equalization of educational opportunities for disadvantaged children. A report on implementation efforts was presented by Sharon P. Robinson, Assistant Secretary of OERI. The passage of the Education Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act, Title IX of the Goals 2000 Educate America Act, reaffirms the Federal government's commitment to reform through research rather than ideology. Progress in making OERI a consumer-driven organization is detailed, with systemic change efforts listed chronologically. Among the most important of the challenges facing OERI is the construction of five new institutes for research and dissemination among which are the Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination, and The National Library of Education. The remarks of Sharon Robinson were followed by discussion and the supporting statements by Edmund W. Gordon, James McPartland, and Beverly J. Walker. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

IR

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DISSEMINATION, AND IMPROVEMENT ACT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED 381 604

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION
AND CIVIL RIGHTS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 15, 1994

Serial No. 103–120

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CD030371

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
87-192 CC WASHINGTON : 1995

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-046655-5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
JACK REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
XAVIER BECERRA, California
ROBERT C. SCOTT, Virginia
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico
RON KLINK, Pennsylvania
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
SCOTTY BAESLER, Kentucky
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
PETER HOEKSTRA, Michigan
HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
DAN MILLER, Florida
MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware

PATRICIA F. RISSLER, *Staff Director*
JAY EAGEN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION AND CIVIL RIGHTS

MAJOR R. OWENS, New York, *Chairman*

DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
ROBERT C. SCOTT, Virginia
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio

CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois

CONTENTS

Page

Hearing held in Washington, DC, September 15, 1994 1

Statement of:

Gordon, Dr. Edmund W., Distinguished Professor of Education Psychology, City College, City University of New York; James McPartland, Director, Center for the Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD; and Beverly J. Walker, Deputy Director, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Oak Brook, IL 38

Robinson, Sharon P., Assistant Secretary, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 3

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:

Gordon, Dr. Edmund W., Distinguished Professor of Education Psychology, City College, City University of New York, prepared statement of 44

McPartland, James, Director, Center for the Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, prepared statement of 73

Robinson, Sharon P., Assistant Secretary, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC, prepared statement of 8

Walker, Beverly J., Deputy Director, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Oak Brook, IL, prepared statement of 86

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DISSEMINATION, AND IMPROVEMENT ACT

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1994

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT
EDUCATION AND CIVIL RIGHTS,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Major R. Owens, Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Representatives Owens and Scott.

Staff present: Maria Cuprill, Braden Goetz, Wanser Green, Robert MacDonald, Gary Karnedy, Hans Meeder and Chris Krese.

Chairman OWENS. The hearing of the Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights is now in session. The Chair is pleased to welcome Assistant Secretary Sharon Robinson, the first person testifying this morning. We are also pleased to welcome a few of the—at least one other very, very special guest, former Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Congressman Gus Hawkins.

This is the second day of the Congressional Black Caucus Legislative Conference, 24th Annual Conference. We are pleased to state that we are attempting to bring maximum intellectual content into the weekend, that day's hearing is part of the process of guaranteeing that the opportunity will not be lost to bring to the attention of the attendees at the conference the importance of educational reform.

It is a well-known fact that a large number of the at-risk students in this Nation are African-American. For the first time, Federal resources will be available to focus intensely on problems which have been clearly identified as priorities by African-American educators.

In 1994, some major initiatives have been launched by the Federal Government. Goals 2000, the legislation which is designed to serve as the engine for school reform, was signed into law and is presently being implemented. School-to-work transition legislation was passed and some States have received large grants for pilot projects. National service legislation is now in its first year of implementation.

An amendment to allow historically-black colleges more time to resolve their delinquent student loan problems passed. Chapter I

legislation is presently in the last stages of negotiation in the Senate/House conference and it contains increases for the poorest urban and rural schools, as well as an amendment which requires that no less than 1 percent of the funds must be spent on parent training and parent involvement.

Mobilizing parents in communities is the main theme of the education brain trust forums and discussions this weekend. We also would like to note and it is quite relevant to today's hearing that the Office of Educational Research and Improvement was restructured to establish a new Priorities Review Board and five new institutes, including an institute for the education of at-risk students. These are impressive legislative initiatives.

Today, we want to discuss the progress which has been made toward the implementation of the OERI restructuring and to ensure OERI is true to its original mission to equalize educational opportunities to disadvantaged children. OERI, if properly utilized, can facilitate the development of an American solution to improve our schools and our work force and to create a learning society. More specifically, today's discussion will focus on the start-up plans for the institute for the education of at-risk students.

What does research and development have to do with the problems I face in my classroom? This is the question I hear most frequently from classroom teachers. This question must be answered clearly and with very practical assistance. We want the Institute for the Education of At-Risk Students to lead the way to some effective solutions for certain persistent, long-term concrete problems.

It is important that start-up plans for the institute set forth a list of priorities which relate to the most vexing problems being encountered by the teachers. Support for the institute will depend on the degree to which practitioners perceive that it is useful.

OERI must be congratulated on its timely and energetic preparations to date. We note there has been a concerted effort to achieve maximum involvement from the members of the education community in the Herculean task of restructuring the office in accordance with the new legislation. This subcommittee will cooperate fully in this process. Together we are all on the spot under a microscope. Concrete results are expected from us. We must resolve that together we will deliver for teachers and we will deliver for children.

I yield to Mr. Scott for an opening statement.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to express my congratulations to you for your long-time leadership on this issue. At-risk children can be educated. They can excel.

Unfortunately, in many areas, they do not. We know that there are some techniques and teaching that need to be used for at-risk students and to the extent that we fail to use everything we have, we are going to have problems in the future. We can sit back and say it is the parents' faults for not bringing their children up right or presenting them to school unprepared to learn, and we can sit back and watch the children get behind, further behind, dropping out and meeting them later in the social service and criminal justice systems, or we can fulfill our responsibilities and address the issue the way we should.

I want to express again my congratulations to you for your leadership, regret the fact that I am going to have to leave very early during the hearing for other responsibilities. But I look forward to the testimony of the witnesses and look forward to doing what we can to make sure that at-risk children get the education that they richly deserve and as a society we owe to them. Thank you.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. We are pleased to call as our first witness the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Education Research and Improvement, Assistant Secretary Sharon Robinson, welcome.

STATEMENT OF SHARON P. ROBINSON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. ROBINSON. Thank you. Good morning. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Scott. I thank you for this opportunity to report on our implementation efforts of the Education Research, Development, Dissemination and Improvement Act.

Passage of this legislation would certainly not have been possible had it not been for the inspiring vision of the role of educational R&D, the bipartisan support of the Congress and especially the determined leadership of the Chair of this committee. Throughout this authorization process, we had an opportunity to witness making a way out of no way, which was often the task of the Chair. But we are privileged to have a chance to implement this really ambitious reform agenda for educational R&D and the role it plays in support of quality education for all of our children.

The bill itself is a part—is Title IX of the Goals 2000 Educate America Act, which really could be no more appropriate framework for this reauthorization because it says as a part of the Federal responsibility to support reform we must provide continuous knowledge and interaction with the field as we make change based on what we know, not change based on caprice or ideology.

Also, the bill puts forth an important principle which we have embraced in this administration; that is, that all children can learn to high academic standards and that no child, no child is dispensable in our society. So with this newly refined mission of educational R&D to inform, change educational policy and practice, with this new vision and mandate to educate all children to higher standards, we have the responsibility of establishing ourselves with educators and those who are going to be participants in reform as a part of the intellectual engine that will fuel reform.

In the bill and in our reform strategies, we have said we must become more customer-oriented. The process of defining that customer has been a very interesting one. Within the department, we have determined that our ultimate customer is the learner, the learner—the learners of America all across the country.

Within OERI, the discussions have also been interesting and sometimes contentious, but we have determined that our ultimate customer is not the researcher, but those who will use the products of these efforts to inform the work that they do to support student instruction. You have also said that our work must—must forever evidence the hallmarks of intellectual and scientific integrity and rigor, that they must not be tainted by political ideology. Set high

standards and have those standards monitored by our board, representing a broad range of the constituencies and the customers who will use our work.

Further, you said we should focus on compelling issues of the day, those issues that confront us and frustrate the realization of our aspirations. You gave us the organizing concept of five national institutes, an Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination, as well as the National Library of Education. In effect, this authorizing legislation changed the work that we do, so we had to change the way we worked.

We began the process of implementing this bill with a tremendous outreach effort to engage the education community and the broader community in a discussion designed to answer what would we be doing if we were, in fact, serving your information and statistical needs? We have talked with the professional community, as well, inside the beltway and beyond.

The collaboration and customer orientation, though, has to be in evidence within OERI, within the department and across the Federal Government, so we have set about the process of involving our colleagues across the department in establishing the intellectual framework of the activities to design our R&D agenda. We are engaged with agencies across the government to understand how we can coordinate the delivery of all kind of services on behalf of students and families, and we are determined to become good collaborators, as well as brokers and facilitators to bring to the service of our customers those things that we have to offer. You will find a chronology of activity on pages 7 through 9 in my testimony.

I would like to talk about the services across the country a bit later on. At this point, though, I would like to turn to the working principles that we developed in the process of studying this legislation and understanding what we would have to have as principles to guide our work if we were to be faithful to the legislation.

As I have mentioned a number of times before, the notion of serving customers is very clear in this bill and the challenge here is to understand that customers are not those that do the work of the agency, but those to be served by the work. It is not sufficient and it is no longer—we can't continue to act as though we believe this trickle-down notion of educational knowledge will really get to the field in time to save our children. In fact, we are involving the customers in designing the work from the basic question through methodology through the products that will convey the work, and I will talk about some of those products a bit later. We are also learning how to cooperate and coordinate so that we are using educational R&D resources more efficiently throughout the department and across the Federal Government.

We will help educational researchers work with practitioners. In fact, we will require it as one of the features of all the work that we do, whether that work is accomplished through the regional laboratories, through the National research centers, through the library programs or through the National Center of Education Statistics. This process of engaging the customer in defining or determining the question is the beginning point of being customer-oriented and it is the foundation of useful coordination.

We are going to have to learn more about collaborating across the—across OERI and across the department. This is another opportunity for maximizing the utility of the precious resources that we have to accomplish this work. Another feature, another principle is learning from practice. There is—there has been an abiding elitism within the educational research community that has separated that community from practitioners such that practitioners might be regarded as subjects or ultimate recipients of work, but not as colleagues in getting the work accomplished. In learning from practice, researchers themselves can enrich the questions they ask, they can enrich their access to data sources in search of answers, and they certainly can enrich the means by which you package the findings so that they are useful to practitioners. We are going to have to focus attention, Mr. Chairman, on developing and preserving the public trust. The work of this agency must be beyond question to have integrity. It must have scientific rigor and it has to be based on questions that are—that are intellectually grounded, rather than questions that are politically inspired. And we are going to have to meet the challenge of communicating all of this to our constituents inside the education community, policy community and the practicing community.

I think that a big part of what we have to do will depend on our capacity to develop an infrastructure to support educational R&D in the Federal agency, in OERI itself, but also in the universities and in the other institutes that—institutions across our country that will interact with us and help produce this work. We are working with teachers to be agents of change, as well as agents to inform the work of OERI, but we are also going to have to work with institutions of higher education to develop and enhance the diversity of the pool of researchers that are able to help us accomplish these ends. Some of the publications that we are trying to develop demonstrate this effort to speak to our more diverse audience and engage in a process of infrastructure building through constituent building.

We are helping to bring awareness that recognizing giftedness is more a matter of informing the eyes of the beholder. And this publication, done in conjunction with one of our labs, we speak to the Indian and Alaskan native community to understand ways that we all can be gifted and we all can benefit by our capacity to recognize giftedness. We also have publications that point to very impressive changes in the trend data of the National assessment of educational progress, data that suggests when you focus on a problem, like math and science improvement, when you change instruction, when you change what you do based on knowledge, you will change the outcomes in terms of student achievement.

The last NAEP trends report contains some very impressive data as it relates to math-science achievement of all ethnic groups and I suspect that that trend reflects the recent changes in or focus on math-science instruction and the focus on standards. You asked me today to comment specifically on our progress to implement the institute on students at risk. I am happy to say that that progress is substantial and it is very impressive. This institute is now established with an acting director, as all the other institutes and the Office of Reform Assistance and National Library of Education

have acting directors. But in this instance, we have just completed an important competition for a major investment in basic research that will be the keystone, if you will, for this institute.

The award for this center will be announced later this month and it will be the beginning of an expenditure that estimated at approximately $27 million over the next five years of work. There are two features of this competition that I want to bring to your attention. The call for these proposals asks that this work focus on definitive studies, meaning we ask for the kind of study whose design and scope and technical rigor would be such that the findings could not be ignored, findings that would be very compelling based on the methodology that produced them.

Second, we ask that this new center seek partnerships and collaborations with a wide range of entities central to providing improved educational opportunities for students at risk. And we ask that this—that these proposals represent greater diversity and greater utilization of underutilized researchers in designing and proposing this work. The competition was, in fact, keen and it was very interesting and encouraging to see that so many were willing to take on this very important task.

This institute will also forge new partnerships with the Office of Elementary-Secondary Education in the department as we begin to implement the new Title I program, as proposed in the authorization now pending, and as we work with State and local leaders to implement Goals 2000, in particular through work with our Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination.

What you will see is that we have asked the research community to stop this business of underestimating the complexity of problems facing this population of students, a habit that has led us to overly simplistic solutions. We will focus heavily on what—we will not focus as heavily on what is provided in the classroom in terms of simple resources or inputs, but we will be looking at a much more complex and a much richer dynamic of interactions between professionals across all social service providers and the context of the community, as well as the dynamics of the family.

This era of oversimplifying everything in order to identify a simple or approachable research problem has led us to be oversimplistic in our solutions in—in the solutions we propose and has led us to a false belief that if we simply intervene in one way, we ought to have fixed these problems. These are complex problems but these students deserve a much more informed and concerted effort on their behalf. This work, we hope, will add to the intelligence of our interventions in the future.

I talked about the public conversations that we implemented in order to understand from a broader community what they need from us. I had a chance to talk with students and parents in communities all across the country,. Many of these students might be labeled at-risk. But I found them to be quite capable of expressing their aspirations for the future and their expectations of us.

In Maine, I met Michael who would have been a student—who would have been a school dropout had it not been for an apprenticeship program in which he was learning to be an apprentice, a machinist. Michael told me how he was meeting the State's fine arts requirement by designing and building a brass table. I was

amazed at the chemistry, the science, the math, the understanding of a number of things that I certainly don't know that Michael had to rely on to produce this product to demonstrate what he knows.

In Austin, Texas, students told me that they were really quite frustrated to be judged as lacking on a State norm referenced standardized test when, in fact, they know that they are learning in a community-based curriculum, with a community-based curriculum and that they are addressing real problems in their community as active citizens.

In Tampa, I talked to a young woman who wanted us to understand how important it is to be able to learn through technology and to interact with students, not just in this country, but all over the world as they understand the nature of the environment in which they will participate as workers and as citizens.

In Chicago, I spoke with parents and teachers who were struggling to work together and understand how to improve practice at the local school level. They were learning to collaborate and they were learning to focus on all their energy—focus their energy on what matters most, which is student achievement.

In Seattle, I heard children talk to me about their future and about real problems that they have to face learning to find a job, but also learning to make a difference and improve the world in which they live. These conversations were very impressive and they helped us to focus on what really matters—the children, the students of this country. As I thought about my testimony today, I wanted to share with you a poem by Nikki Giovanni, because in this poem, she expresses this focus in very eloquent terms.

The name of the poem is "Always There Are The Children."

"And always there are the children. There will be children in the heat of day.

There will be children in the cold of winter. Children, like a quilted blanket, are welcomed in our old age.

Children, like a block of ice to a desert sheik, are a sign of status in our youth.

We feed the children with our culture that they might understand our travail. We nourish the children with our gods that they might understand respect.

We urge the children on the tracts that our race will not fall short. But children are not ours nor we theirs. They are the future. We are past.

How do we welcome the future? Not with the colonialism of the past, for that is our problem. Not with the racism of the past, for that is their problem. Not with the fears of our own status, for history is lived, not dictated.

We welcome the young of all groups as our own with solid nourishment of food and warmth. We prepare the way with the solid nourishment of self-actualization.

We implore all the young to prepare for the young because always there will be the children."

I think we in OERI have had a chance to understand that always there are the children and the students of this country, and that has to be our abiding and compelling focus. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Robinson follows:]

Dr. Sharon P. Robinson
Assistant Secretary
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

I. OVERVIEW

My remarks today might best be understood as a State of the OERI address. And what may now be reported, without qualification and without exaggeration, is that OERI is proving equal to the challenges implicit in the Reauthorization legislation of March 1994. We are "a work in progress." The progress is substantial.

You, the members of Congress, crafted a boldly innovative document that stated in no uncertain terms that only a radical break with the past--only an agenda that shattered the status quo, only a *revolution*--would suffice.

- You offered us the opportunity to transform OERI into a consumer-driven organization that would create a treasure chest of research results readily accessible to America's education decisionmakers.
- You charged us with the responsibility of building a secure foundation on which to design school improvements that would benefit every American student, but especially those who--because of poverty, inadequate health care, violence, and racism--have too often been exiled from the American dream and condemned to the American nightmare.
- You told us to replace the politics of confrontation with the politics of collaboration--and to unite in common cause researchers, teachers, administrators, parents, social service professionals, members of the business community, and office holders at every level of government.

Perhaps most importantly, you instructed us to advance the national education goals by establishing a research base that would support the efforts of classroom practitioners to give life to the principle that ***all*** *children can learn to high academic standards*.

You handed us an ambitious agenda. In fact, as Assistant Secretary of OERI, the first time I read the Reauthorization legislation, I couldn't help but think of the words of the old Negro spiritual--"This time, Lord, you gave me a mountain."

But today it is possible to report that we are scaling that mountain, and though the climb is over rough terrain, we are persevering. We are prevailing. The federal educational research enterprise is now poised to play a significant role in ensuring that the current wave of education reform initiatives will generate significant, substantive change for *all students and over the long haul*. In addition, we are well on the way to developing a new relationship with our core customers--teachers, students, parents, and school administrators. We are laying the groundwork for a citizens' alliance for educational progress. We are *listening*--and we are giving respectful consideration to the views of the classroom practitioners, parents, students, employers, health professionals, members of the clergy, and all other civic-minded citizens.

All of this is part of confronting the challenge of how best to improve our capacity to demonstrate the relevance of research to classroom realities. We are developing a demand-driven research agenda. Issues concerning how schools

can change to enhance student learning take on a different complexion and meaning if they emerge from real people striving to resolve real problems within stubbornly complex contexts. No longer can we continue to act on the mythical assumption that researchers themselves are the final arbiters of what counts as "useful" research. This is myopia of the highest order. It must end. It *will* end.

We understand very well that the reauthorization of OERI is a plan to ensure that what we discover and develop is relevant, accessible, and available to the wide range of constituencies involved in or affected by education. All must be engaged as *partners* in education reform. Long-term, substantive education reform begins in the home, is sustained in the classroom, fostered in the community, and lasts for a lifetime.

OERI's new, more egalitarian, more collaborative, consumer-driven mission would likely have remained an abstract concept rather than a concrete reality were it not for the bipartisan consensus that gave rise to the Reauthorization legislation. And this consensus would have proved elusive were it not for the enlightened leadership of Chairman Major Owens. Surely every member of this subcommittee understands that Congressman Owens remained relentless in making the case that only a radical reorganization of OERI would unleash the potential of educational research and dissemination to break the cycle of low expectations and cynicism that too often defeats our students and teachers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Thanks to Major Owens and other members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, the Department of Education is now committed as never before to an agenda that will ensure every child in America equal access to an education that is driven by higher, more rigorous standards than at any previous time in our nation's history. This Administration is determined to expose the myth that educating all students requires the dilution of standards and the diminution of expectations. The contrary is true: the higher the standards, the higher the achievement. The most recent results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress testify to this fact.

The force that sustains this Administration's education agenda is the conviction that ***no*** *child is dispensable, and* ***all*** *children can learn.* The heart of the Educate America Act, as well as the pending reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is an unrelenting effort to demonstrate that equity and excellence in education, far from being mutually exclusive, are tightly interdependent. You can't have one without the other. At OERI, our commitment to this principle ensures that the nation's education research enterprise will advance the national education goals that are the vital center of the Educate America Act.

The work in which we are now engaged is critical to the cause of ensuring that *all* American students develop the knowledge, skill, and habits of mind we once expected of only our *top* students.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that on this score, we have along way to go. The most recent NAEP report (NAEP 1992 Trends in Academic Progress) presents a mixed picture. But it is a picture that, upon close examination, suggests at least one prerequisite for improving academic performance, especially among students traditionally pigeon-holed and condemned to slow academic tracks.

The NAEP results reveal few improvements in reading and writing among white, black, or Hispanic students over the past decade. By contrast, during this same time frame, all three racial/ethnic subgroups made notable improvement in mathematics and science. I would like to think that at least part of this progress can be accounted for by the fact that math and science teachers were among the first to develop and disseminate strict national standards. The evidence suggests that clear and demanding standards for achievement had a salutary impact on all students. Higher expectations by teachers lifted students to new heights.

II. THE SYSTEMIC REFORM OF OERI

The Reauthorization of OERI mandated a major change in *the business we do*. What became instantly clear is that this would not be possible without a major change in *the way we do business*.

If we were to democratize the research enterprise, we needed first to democratize OERI. If we were, in good faith, to disseminate the research-based

6

conclusion that hierarchical management stymies creativity in our schools, we needed to flatten the hierarchy in which we ourselves worked. Our objective was to have OERI itself model the organizational culture we knew facilitated improved instruction and improved achievement in our schools.

Let me outline, in chronological order, the steps we have taken to change.

- October 1993 marks the beginning of our effort to reinvent OERI. At that time, nine papers were drafted by OERI staff working groups. The papers focused on the five proposed National Research Institutes, the Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination, The National Library of Education and two general, cross-cutting areas (Professional Development and Technology in Education). These papers constituted the initial step toward an OERI research priorities agenda.

- December 1993. Kick-off Meeting with Department Colleagues.
  The Assistant Secretary invites OERI's Education Department colleagues to become "partners" in reinventing OERI.

- February - March 1994. Meetings with Department Partners.
  OERI holds a series of nine meetings with its Education Department Partners to gather input on its staff's Working Group Papers. OERI will continue to meet with its Partners throughout the course of the OERI reinvention process.

7

- March - May 1994: Meetings with National Education Organizations and Associations

  The Assistant Secretary meets with representatives from 35 education associations and organizations to discuss a new vision for OERI and its FY 1995 budget. Additionally, eight other meetings are held with individuals representing over 50 national, state, and academic associations to discuss the changing federal-state-local relationship.

- April - May 1994: Public "Conversations"

  In conjunction with local school districts, meetings are held to identify issues OERI should consider in its reinvention and research agenda. At each site (Tampa/St Petersburg, Florida; Austin, Texas; Portland, Maine; Seattle, Washington; and Chicago, Illinois), the Assistant Secretary asks teachers, students, administrators, parents, business leaders, and researchers this question: What would we be doing if we were serving *your needs* for research and statistical services? These discussions will play a central role in OERI's effort to distill an education research agenda for the next five-, ten- and fifteen-year periods to be presented to the incoming National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board early in the new year.

- April 1994 Forward Planning Retreat

  The Assistant Secretary meets with OERI senior staff to discuss ways to involve all staff in planning the reinvention of OERI. The Assistant Secretary then invites the entire OERI staff to participate in the reinvention process.

- May 1994 Designation of Reinvention Teams and Planning and Implementation Council

  The Assistant Secretary forms OERI staff teams charged with identifying key issues and developing options and recommendations for reinventing OERI. The Assistant Secretary also announces the creation of a Planning and Implementation Council that will serve in an advisory capacity during the reinvention process. The Council is composed of the Assistant Secretary, OERI staff, and senior Education Department officials.

- June 1994 Nominations to National Board

  The Assistant Secretary places a Notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER announcing that Secretary Riley is accepting nominations for appointees to OERI's National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board.

- June-July 1994 Expert Panel Review

  The Working Group Papers are forwarded to panels of content experts for review and feedback.

- July 1994: Public Outreach

  OERI issues a notice soliciting public comment on OERI's implementation of its reauthorization provisions. The public is invited to comment on all or any aspect of the law reauthorizing OERI. The comments will help the Assistant Secretary plan for the reorganization of OERI and set the agenda for strategies to implement the initiatives designated by the new legislation. The public is also advised that comments may be forwarded to OERI via the INTERNET. This use of the "information highway" as a means of eliciting public views on a government program is a first for OERI.

- July 1994: Expert Panel Chairpersons Meeting

  The Expert Review Panel offers its critiques of the Working Group Papers that staff had developed for the Institutes within the new OERI.

- September 1994: Reinvention Action

  The Assistant Secretary dissolves the existing OERI units, announces the Acting Directors of the five new National Research Institutes, the Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination, the National Library of Education, and Information Services. In addition, the Assistant Secretary declares an "open season" during which all employees will have the opportunity to express their wishes regarding where they believe they can serve most productively and with greatest satisfaction within the new OERI.

III. TRANSLATING LEGISLATIVE MANDATES INTO WORKING PRINCIPLES

During the OERI reinvention activities, we began to develop a set of cardinal principles that would guide our work. These principles, enumerated below, are perhaps best understood as the end product of our effort to translate the spirit of OERI Reauthorization legislation into precepts for action. Every activity that OERI engages in must exhibit fidelity to these precepts.

1. Put the customer first

Too often researchers lose sight of the needs and aspirations of the individuals who will use what they've developed. As a result, a great deal of research never gets translated into practice or takes an inordinate amount of time to "trickle down" to schools and classrooms. This is an inefficient, self-serving, and ultimately self-defeating way of doing business. National education research and improvement officials must be responsive to the unique needs of their diverse constituencies. Within the new OERI, basic research will remain a vital component, but the "customer" will be an integral part of planning, not an afterthought. We will also commit ourselves to a renewed emphasis on disseminating research results in a user-friendly manner.

2. Cooperate and coordinate

Cooperation and coordination in education research guards against unnecessary duplication and waste of scarce resources. Too often research is conducted without the information-sharing needed to generate a coherent

research program that best meets the needs of education providers and recipients. A reinvented OERI will help researchers work with practitioners to solve school-based problems. All of OERI's programs and functions -- Regional Laboratories and Research Centers, Library Programs, the National Center for Education Statistics, product development, information dissemination, etc. -- will be linked through a number of topic-related Research Institutes and an Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination. The result will be minimum bureaucratic compartmentalization and maximum opportunity to build fruitful partnerships.

3. Collaborate

Working jointly on a given problem or project will be a hallmark of OERI's Research Institutes, its Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination, its Library Programs Office, and its National Center for Education Statistics. Activities that call for the collective expertise of staff from different parts of OERI will be identified, and new organizational patterns will be developed to facilitate information-sharing, teamwork, and intra-Office collaboration. Collaboration will also extend beyond OERI to involve other offices within the Department of Education and, where appropriate, between OERI and federal offices outside of the Department of Education. Finally, collaborative partnerships also will be developed between OERI and states, communities, and schools.

4. Learn from practice

As researchers and practitioners work together to develop rich, challenging, and stimulating learning environments, they bring specialized knowledge to their collaboration. Researchers bring theoretical insights emerging from years of efforts to understand how children learn. Practitioners bring practical wisdom from years of real-world efforts to help children learn in real classrooms and schools. As practitioners and researchers work together, they develop a shared knowledge base that is more vast, more easily translated into practice, and more student-centered than the knowledge either group initially possessed. In this way, collaborations yield a firmer, more powerful shared knowledge base to support instructional practice.

The work of the new OERI will be built on strong and enduring partnerships between researchers and practitioners. They will be the cornerstone of OERI's effort to construct a reality-based research and development program.

5. Build and preserve the public trust

The work that OERI supports must not be tainted by politics. The public must be confident that the questions pursued and the products disseminated remain free of political ideology. A strengthened, self-sufficient, and stable OERI must produce information and statistical services that are recognized by the public and media as valid, accurate, and trustworthy. OERI must make a firm commitment to ensuring that the work it supports is honest and unbiased, that

decisions about the work are freely made, and that this work is carried out in an atmosphere free of destructive quarreling over whether it is subservient to special interests.

6. Communicate

For the new OERI, communication will mean listening to the needs of its constituents and providing the knowledge, products, and tools that *they* deem useful. The new OERI will also listen and respond to the expectations of the Executive Branch and the Congress. Although OERI will safeguard its integrity and never condone ideologically driven imposition, it nonetheless has an obligation to be cooperative with other parts of the Executive branch and with the Congress.

7. Become a national resource for researchers, practitioners, policy makers, and parents

The new OERI must pursue questions that are both important and enduring rather than immediate and fashionable. The work of OERI will have extraordinary payoff for education improvement when it has intrinsic merit, is done successfully, and is timely. If OERI is to be truly "all that it can be", to be an authentic national resource for America's $400 billion educational enterprise, it is imperative that professional staff remember that the ultimate goal of their work is to improve the academic achievement of America's students.

8. Preserve and enhance the infrastructure of educational research and development

OERI must continue to support and encourage the talent pool of researchers that education needs. OERI must also recognize that supporting the educational research and development infrastructure goes beyond funding research projects. This support must include concentrated focus on developing and enhancing the talent and productivity of all members of the education community. Teacher development must be seen as worthy work in which the best practitioners create a future in harmony with their most ambitious vision of professional excellence.

Mr. Chairman, although our journey is far from complete, I have brought along some of the most recent publications that represent significant first steps toward operationalizing the principles I've outlined. Publications like Identifying Outstanding Talent in American Indian and Alaska Native Students (with a vibrant cover by Vic Runnels of the Lakota tribe) seeks to review and synthesize the most promising practices used to identify exceptionally talented students among the native populations of our country, as well as to suggest areas in which additional research would likely produce promising results.

IV. THE FUTURE IS NOW (ALMOST)

Let me now turn to perhaps one of the most significant challenges ahead for us--building a set of new National Institutes that are vitally connected with each other, with the rest of the Department, with other federal agencies, and with the

broader education community. It will be through carefully and skillfully forging these connections that the promise of the Reauthorization legislation will be fully realized.

Mr. Chairman, you have asked me to comment specifically today about the progress we are making with regard to the Institute on the At-Risk.

I am aware that this Institute shares a special place in your heart, Mr. Chairman, as it does mine. In addition, this National Institute represents a critical link in this Administration's multi-dimensional assault on the roots of educational inequality. In numerous pieces of legislation--most notably the School-to-Work Bill, the Head Start Reauthorization Act, the new ESEA, the IDEA reauthorization, as well as in its unswerving commitment to the health care young Americans must have if their academic potential is not to be crippled by untreated illnesses and undiagnosed learning difficulties, this Administration has signaled its determination to eradicate the sources of the inequality that threaten the most sacred ideals of our democratic heritage.

The Institute on the At-Risk has the potential to become a major force in this journey toward the day when "savage inequalities" no longer scar our educational landscape. The new Institute's broad legislative mandate is a challenge to us all. If we prove equal to this challenge, future historians will see the Institute as the source of a seachange in the way that the federal government conducts itself in relationship to the thousands of students who

leave school or drop out without the fundamental skills necessary to do more than simply survive in the new global economy. Your leadership has galvanized the federal government to signal its vigorous commitment to the principle that that the level of student failure we have witnessed in the past is not acceptable--and will no longer be tolerated.

In a larger sense, the mission of this new Institute is critical to our long-term success in making American education the engine of America's progress. Only by igniting a new commitment to equity will we be able to tackle the monumental challenges that result from our proud position as the most diverse society in history, with global economic preeminence that can be sustained only if it is propelled by all the talent, all the knowledge, and all the skill of all the people. America must become a learning community. And that community must exclude no one.

As a downpayment on OERI's commitment to make the new Institute on the At-Risk play a leadership role, we have completed the competition for one of the largest National Research and Development Centers ever funded, with an estimated $27 million to be provided over five years. This new Center (the award winner will be announced September 30) will be the initial intellectual dynamo for the new Institute. The application announcement for this new Center makes clear that in this area we are not interested in "business as usual."

17

This Center will be unprecedented in at least two main ways. First, we will demand that some of the studies produced will be "definitive"--meaning "the kind of study whose design, scope and technical rigor are such that the findings will not be ignored." Second, we are asking that the new Center seek partnerships and collaborations with a wide range of entities central to providing improved opportunities for students at risk. Collaborations with teacher unions, other professional organizations, minority and child advocacy groups, and state-level education and legislative agencies will be necessary. It is imperative that the work of the new Center contribute to the consensus-building outreach activities of the new Institute.

The Institute on At-Risk will be built on a solid research and development foundation. But its credibility and leadership will depend not only on the quality of its research, but on its readiness to work with teachers, parents, students, and other community members who are our most valuable sources of information when the issue is what *they* need to improve their schools and enhance student achievement. The Institute will also forge new partnerships with the staff of the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education as they begin to implement the new Title One program and work with state and local education agencies. Through the new Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination, the Institute will have an important role in helping states implement their Goals 2000 plans.

The Institute on the At-Risk, I need to reemphasize, will not work in isolation. It will work in close collaboration of the other four National Institutes and will take an intensely holistic approach to the effort to rescue young people from failure.

In the past we have too often compartmentalized problems and too often encased ourselves within rigid ways of seeing teaching and learning. We have underestimated the complexity of problems and, as a result, have been drawn to overly simplistic solutions. Educational researchers have been guilty, along with a variety of other intellectuals, of seeing the "at-risk" in narrow and segmented ways. We have focused heavily on what is or is not provided in the classroom, while other professionals (most notably social and health workers) have studied their own discrete areas. Our common error has been a failure to reach across our self-created divides and talk about the whole child and the whole family and the whole community. As a result, our tendency has been to treat isolated symptoms, not underlying pathologies.

We need, now more than ever, to be bolder, more imaginative, and above all more holistic in our thinking. OERI intends to be a leader here. Although many are talking about the need for integrated and coordinated services, this movement will have little impact on schools until and unless we take steps to learn from those who have pioneered such approaches. Only then will we be able to forge, in consultation with professionals from a wide array of occupations, a highly integrated research and practice agenda for schools.

To this end, later this month I will be hosting a four-day Working Conference for School-Linked Services for Children and Families. We will be focused on removing barriers that inhibit the integration of social services at the school site. I will also be inviting over 100 people representing a variety of foundations, services, and professions to explore how we might foster interprofessional education so that professionals working in the same communities do not continue to be isolated by their vocabularies and approaches.

I want this conference to symbolize the kind of interdisciplinary, inclusive, learning-from-practice approach that will inform all our work. Because of the importance I attach to this conference, I will also host a post-conference forum on October 3 at which OERI staff and others will begin discussion of how to apply what we have learned about interdisciplinary collaboration to the inner workings of all five National Institutes.

V. CONGRESS, POLITICS, AND THE INTEGRITY OF OERI

Let me conclude with a special request to this subcommittee, all other members of Congress, and members of the Clinton Administration.

As I mentioned earlier, the reinvention of OERI in which we are engaged will be successful to the extent that we secure and preserve the public trust. The public must be confident that the questions we pursue and the products we develop and disseminate remain untainted by political ideology. Our integrity must be beyond reproach.

If this vision is to be realized, we will need your support , your cooperation, *and your vigilance*. Congress and the Administration are in accord on the need for new organizational mechanisms to ensure that OERI stands secure as a non-partisan entity, devoted to independent research, and responsive to the needs of the public, not the needs of a political party.

In all probability, this ideological neutrality will sometimes prove irksome or unpopular. That's a reality that all of us at OERI will have to learn to live with. But you can help us retain our integrity. You can stand with us when we insist that OERI funds will never serve partisan purposes. Above all, you can remind your colleagues that OERI's primary constituency is America's children. These children are not Republicans or Democrats. They are young people in need--in need of an education that unleashes their full potential and prepares them to be both productive workers who contribute to the vitality of our economy and active citizens who help sustain the health of our democracy.

Although it may be somewhat unorthodox this setting, I want to drive home this message by concluding my remarks with a poem that says a lot about the ideals that define OERI's mission. The poem, by Nikki Giovanni, is entitled--

ALWAYS THERE ARE THE CHILDREN

21

ALWAYS THERE ARE THE CHILDREN

and always there are the children

there will be children in the heat of day
there will be children in the cold of winter

children like a quilted blanket
are welcomed in our old age

children like a block of ice to a desert sheik
are a sign of status in our youth

we feed the children with our culture
that they might understand our travail

we nourish the children on our gods
that they may understand respect

we urge the children on the tracks
that our race will not fall short

but children are not ours
nor we theirs they are future we are past

how do we welcome the future
not with the colonialism of the past
  for that is our problem
not with the racism of the past
  for that is their problem
not with the fears of our own status
for history is lived not dictated

we welcome the young of all groups
as our own with solid nourishment
of food and warmth

we prepare the way with the solid
nourishment of self-actualization

we implore all the young to prepare for the young
because always there will be children

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. I think the children of the Nation, as well as the entire education community, is quite fortunate to have you, Madam Secretary, because you are, first of all, a teacher, and you have been a local administrator and you know the problems out there. I am going to yield first to Mr. Scott for questions.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very much encouraged by what I have heard today. I will make a few comments and just one or two questions.

We are members of the Committee on Education and Labor. I think just the fact that the name of the committee suggests that there is a very close correlation between the two. We know that education will determine what kind of jobs you can get, if any, in the future, what kind of future you have, and yet we tolerate dropout rates of 25 and 50 percent in many communities, certainly, many in my community. And the extent that we tolerate that, we are also tolerating, I guess, two of the major social issues of the day, crime and welfare.

I visited schools. In the elementary schools we see young, energetic, bright, spirited young people and you visit a middle school and a high school and you see that spirit just about gone, that they have—although the body is still in the school, they look like they have dropped out and it is just a matter of time.

Madam Secretary, you have, I think, made—took several opportunities to disparage the politics of some of this going on. We have just been through three strikes and you are out. Nice little simple sound byte. Doesn't make any sense when you try to analyze it. Sometime this month or next month, or certainly by next year, we will consider two years and you are out as our guiding principle for welfare reform. Another nice little simplistic slogan.

And based on your remarks—I don't want to put words in your mouth, but I would assume that you think that some of these problems are a little more complex than that and that we ought to put a little more research into our decision-making process. If we have the research that you are suggesting that we are going to get, if we had that research on the criminal justice policy and welfare policy, I think we could make a much better use of our time and effort and resources in addressing those problems. I guess one question I have is the scope of the research, whether or not you are going to focus it very narrowly on things that are traditionally education or whether you will broaden it to suggest that our schools ought to do some social service and other kinds of social support.

Ms. ROBINSON. Well, it is an interesting point in time, because it is now apparent that while the school is recognized as a point of intervention for change, it is also being recognized that the family is probably the more appropriate unit for service and support, rather than isolated students or children, as they enter the juvenile justice system or—you have to understand how all of these systems bear on and support or frustrate families.

Later this month, we will be hosting a four-day working conference involving a number of Federal agencies and the researchers who support the work in those agencies from HHS, to agriculture, to justice, to HUD, as well as NIH, to look at this issue of coordinated services around—in support of families so that we can join

in understanding where we have built in barriers to doing the work that we want to do on behalf of these families.

Also, we want to understand how we can fashion the knowledge that supports professional practice so that these future practitioners will understand they will work in collaboration with one another and not in isolated industries, if you will, that sometimes trip over one another or get in one another's way and sometimes they compete. That is the absolute worst case. But the points you are making around--between the policy and the practice dynamic, it is really interesting. I wonder what kind of world we would have if we were already acting, based on what we know rather than based on habit.

We already know more about recognizing student achievement than we use. If we were to use more of what we know, perhaps some of these students would be more inspired to stay in school because they would be more aware of their capacity than they would be aware of their defects. If we used what we know about instructional practice more extensively, students would be more engaged. They would stay in school.

We are finding that offering challenging curriculum to all students, rather than diluting the standards and bringing everybody down, actually brings everybody up. We are now offering courses in math and science in inner-city schools that would not have been thought reasonable or appropriate at another point in time. But our understanding about the dynamic of learning, the understanding that it is hard work and challenge that inspires people, not dull, routine drill and practice, that will change practice and change schools.

Now, this will in fact, I think, make us have to think very hard about resource distribution. It will make us have to think very hard about the policy framework for practice in education and in other social services. So if we are going to place limits on the time that a person can participate in welfare or the time that a person can participate in school, I think we have to be equally concerned about making that time rich and beneficial to the clients.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, I don't think we are going to have trouble with resources if we get some research-based information. Next week the Commonwealth of Virginia will consider a crime bill which will abolish parole. They will spend an average of about $75 million per congressional district in the State for capital improvements and about $40 million a year running the prisons that they build to codify that soundbite.

If we are willing to put that kind of money after it is already too late, I think a little research would help us show that any—just a little slice of that money could go a long way into eliminating a number of problems that we have. How long will it take to get some of this research out so we can start putting it to use?

Ms. ROBINSON. Well, actually, I think we can start doing a better job of developing products to convey what we know to appropriate users. One of the challenges in implementing this bill is to establish the offer of reform assistance and dissemination. In this office, we have to build connections with that diverse community of customers to understand how to talk to policymakers, to bring the

findings to you in a way that helps you address problems that are of concern to you.

We have to find a way to interact with parents and practitioners in order to share these findings and help you make decisions. That is the immediate concern for that particular office, and I don't think we have to wait for new knowledge. I believe that we have findings that we urgently need to begin to convey to the policy community and the practice community, but we have to discover the means of getting those conversations under way.

Mr. SCOTT. Do you have the longitudinal studies show long-term how some of these things work out? I know there is one overworked study on Head Start that keeps getting dragged out because I think it is about the only study that has been done on a longitudinal basis. Are there other studies that show how we can actually make a real difference?

Ms. ROBINSON. Well, we have trend data from the long history of the NAEP report. We have trend data from other big data collection activities. We have to now develop more confidence in our interpretation capacity, and that, I think, involves engaging more people in discussing these findings and making meaning out of the findings. We tend to put the data out there and we have a momentary beep on the media screen and then we go back and do another study. That's just not enough.

These studies represent a very important investment, and when we see that our job is concluded simply by issuing a report then I think we are stopping well short of the mark. We have to go further and engage in these discussions which help to make meaning and help to make these findings useful. So I think that while these products are impressive and we work very hard on the covers—and they are appropriate for some audiences, I bring them to just demonstrate the array of issues on which we have something to talk about. But this doesn't necessarily represent the structure of the conversation or the interaction that we need to have to make them useful to you.

Mr. SCOTT. I can't wait. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Madam Secretary, you mentioned before about what is known about capacity, the need to emphasize the capacity of children versus their defects. I took note of that because just last Saturday, I dropped in on a breakfast honoring a great educator and she was speaking about the same subject at great length. She is here with us today, one of the most important policymakers in New York State. The New York State Board of Regents is responsible for education from preschool all the way to postgraduate and for licensing professionals of all kinds, doctors, lawyers, et cetera. So she is a very powerful educator and powerful person in our educational structure. Regent Adelaide Sanford is here with us today. She was speaking about the same subject of capacity and failure to demonstrate to youngsters what their capacity is and failure to build on that in part of the education process.

Let me begin with an upbeat question or observation that you can explain in more detail. We already have an effort which is funded to the tune of $27 million over five years to launch the spirit of the Institute on Education of At-Risk Students. Can you ex-

plain a little more about what you are talking about? That is a funding for a center.

Ms. ROBINSON. Right.

Chairman OWENS. And we don't usually fund centers at the level of $27 million over five years.

Ms. ROBINSON. Right.

Chairman OWENS. It is more like a million to two million per year over five years, never more than 10 million. So this is an extraordinary effort and it is already underway and it is to be the forerunner, as I understand, to be the forerunner of the institute in terms of substance. Can you explain that in a little more detail?

Ms. ROBINSON. Well, we have an opportunity with the recompetition of all the other national research and development centers in 1995. Right now, there are about 18 of them. These centers are focused on very narrow bands of issues, research questions. We would like working through our board, our research priorities board, to establish a research agenda that will allow us to offer competitions that are for much greater funds so that these centers can do research that is more rigorous so that the findings themselves will have more—more standing and that the investment in basic research has a bigger payoff.

When we fund these research centers at the tune of one million for this and one million for that, what we are asking for is rather modest methodology. We are not asking for significant sample sizes. We are not asking for intense observations. We are not asking for the rigor and analysis that we probably need in order to better understand some of these questions. So it is a challenge to the research community, as well.

I mean, I had some folks say to me how can you do $5 million in the first—worth of work in the first year? Well, if that is not possible, don't propose it was my answer. But let us not be constrained for once by an artificial resource limit. Here is an opportunity to say what you can do with this amount—with this amount of money. So we want the findings to be much more compelling in the work done by these centers.

Chairman OWENS. You expect to complete the selection, complete this competitive process and select the sponsor for the center.

Ms. ROBINSON. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. In September.

Ms. ROBINSON. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. So by October first we will have the selection completed.

Ms. ROBINSON. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. That means that that center will have a budget of about $5 million for the first year to start?

Ms. ROBINSON. Exactly.

Chairman OWENS. And that center is called what?

Ms. ROBINSON. That will be the National Center on Students At Risk of School Failure.

Chairman OWENS. It has a new name.

Ms. ROBINSON. That is the new name.

Chairman OWENS. Which parallels the institute.

Ms. ROBINSON. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. I want to make that clear. That gets the institute off in substance, really.

Ms. ROBINSON. Right. The additional resources that we expect to have focused on the center after we work with our board to establish a research agenda, we may have another center in the Institute on At-Risk Students. We also want to have a program, field-initiated studies. But that hope will be determined after we see the appropriations levels and so forth.

Additionally, the Institute on Student Achievement will be doing work that informs and supports the Institute on Students At Risk. The organizing plan for OERI has these institutes as being established with directors that we hope to recruit and have in place by fiscal 1996.

Chairman OWENS. That was the next question I was going to ask. The acting directors now, that is just a practical necessity.

Ms. ROBINSON. Right.

Chairman OWENS. You will actually select people and allow an open process for selecting directors.

Ms. ROBINSON. Absolutely.

Chairman OWENS. When they are ready to go.

Ms. ROBINSON. Absolutely. We will make some assessment of that along with the board as we see how the work that we can assign to these institutes would represent a compelling career opportunity for the kind of researchers we want to attract to the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to work in these institutes.

I expect that we will have no trouble recruiting for the institutes, the Office of Reform Assistance and the National Library of Education, but in order to really communicate the opportunity that it exists, we will need some time to further plan and to work with the board in understanding the nature of the people we want to recruit and in establishing a good rigorous recruitment strategy.

Chairman OWENS. But for the center that will start on October 1 that is a university-based, either one university.

Ms. ROBINSON. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. Or a consortium of universities will be the sponsor.

Ms. ROBINSON. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. And they will select their own staff and researchers. I just want to make that clear.

Ms. ROBINSON. That is right.

Chairman OWENS. We have an unusual situation today in that at the end of this hearing with the panelists, we are going to invite some people who are here to join us and make a few comments, and I want them to know clear what we are talking about so they can ask any further questions they may have. I don't know whether you will be able to stay with us or not.

Ms. ROBINSON. I will.

Chairman OWENS. I certainly appreciate you being here for this part. I just want to say we are ready to begin a process, university-based process, as of October 1 and after the sponsor is announced, people should check to see where they are, where the action is. Let me go a little further to a more difficult question, and that is how does the restructuring and the start-up of the new structure for

OERI, how does it relate to the streamlining and downsizing that is taking place in the Federal Government?

Are we going to be adversely impacted by that? Here is Department of Education, which has always suffered and been classified as sort of a second-class recipient of funds here in the executive structure. Is this downsizing and streamlining of the Federal Government going to impact on our ability to really move forward with this restructuring?

Ms. ROBINSON. On the downsizing side question, we had projected a contribution to reducing the FTE of five people over 1995 through 1996. Given this restructuring and the very ambitious work that is been assigned to the agency, that number is now being reconsidered within the department and we will be working probably with a range that will—that will not adversely affect us.

What we did benefit from is the buyout in that we created an opportunity to recruit new talent into the agency. While we lost some very important institutional memory and some very important talent, we have a chance to offer opportunities now to come and work in the—in this industry on behalf of the Federal Government that would not have existed had it not been for the buyout. It is hard getting through this to realize the benefit, however, because in the meantime, we are operating full steam ahead with 50—with over 50 fewer people than we might have had without the buyout.

Chairman OWENS. I appreciate the diplomatic way you say that. I am happy to see that you have lost some dead weight, some folks with old guard reasoning and we have an opportunity to bring in some people who will be in harmony with where we want to go. I appreciate your diplomacy. Continue.

Ms. ROBINSON. The other aspect of this—of our authority that I will—I think will be challenging to us is the responsibility to coordinate R&D across the department and with other appropriate Federal agencies. The effort to establish a system for that kind of coordination, that kind of discipline, that kind of policy and program coherence is rather intensive, and we will need to allocate resources to get that done. That is not something that happens just because it is a good idea and everybody says it ought to happen. So we have functions to accomplish that that were not envisioned and not provided for in the old OERI.

Fortunately, we have people who have been kind of developing some of these talents, though they were not called upon to exercise them. Now they have an opportunity to do that.

Chairman OWENS. Let the record show that I think that within Washington, the Department of Education is not the place where downsizing should take place. The entire department needs to be built up. There is a lot of room for downsizing in Washington. You can cut the CIA about three-quarters right away. There is a number of places where downsizing should take place. I think education is one of the functions that certainly—the budget and the staff should be increased.

Let me move to another area, and I am going to be cautious. My staff often cautions me and tells me they don't want to be embarrassed by my over simplistic or simple-minded questions. And my enemies accuse me of being intellectual, but my staff doesn't think

I know all about this research and development and the level at which it has to operate.

Is it out of order to ask questions like will we have, as this process moves along, answers to some of these basic questions that are being asked out there on the firing line? People want to know just how important is multicultural education. How important is Afrocentric education or studentcentric education? A student is Italian, you ought to have Italian-centered education, something to make them understand where they came from and how their heritage blends in with the mainstream heritage and to inspire them and to improve their sense of self worth.

It applies to students across the board, not just to African-American students. Is this really important and why can't we have a firmer foundation to establish for it, you know, in research? A separate sex class. A lot of controversy about that. Will somebody tell us whether there is any basis for this, whether there is any reason to believe this is going to improve anything?

Somewhere along the line can we expect some answers soon from experts about whether this has any promise? Disruptive students, every teacher, very concerned about disruptive students.

In New York City, we have now the mayor and a special overlord for the Board of Education auditing the board and pointing out that $16,000 per student is being spent on special ed. students versus less than $6 on the other students. And we know that a lot of those special ed. students really shouldn't be there. They are children who have problems maybe in terms of behavior, but they are not—don't really fall in the category of special education. They have been dumped in there, emotionally disturbed and a couple other categories.

And the real problem is, there is a need to deal with behavior problems and there is a need to deal with the disruptive student or maybe the teachers were not trained to cope with certain kinds of students and you have a disruptive, disorderly classroom as a result, delinquency students who have delinquent problems. These are raging practical problems. Is it too much to expect that we are going to get some answers out of this research and development process we are now initiating, certainly from the Institute of At-Risk Students?

Ms. ROBINSON. I don't think that it is too much to expect that you are going to get some possible answers. Nor is it too much to expect that we will learn to deliver a process by which practitioners and parents and community folks can be much more analytical as they study these situations and these problems and as they craft their own solutions based on fundings out of research that we support.

I do think that it would be—it would be unfortunate if we would think of our work as delivering recipes or templates to practitioners. What we ought to deliver is a framework for understanding these issues and access to a knowledge base that will enhance your ability to craft solutions.

I am really not trying to dodge the question, but I don't want us to think of this as a one-way interaction or even two-way if it is simply we tell you what we need and you send us a booklet. I think we have to start to develop a set of expectations within the edu-

cation and research community where we work together to answer these questions.

Ms. ROBINSON. If we were to move on to use one example, the issue of multi-cultural education, I really think that we have let that issue get not over—not just oversimplified, but politicized such that we threaten a very important aspect of pedagogy, practice, which is having the teacher have the responsibility and capacity to bring materials and opportunities for learning to this, that that learner can really relate to and interact with and benefit from. If the way to that student's heart is through his cultural heritage, that teacher must not be barred from using that practice. In fact that teacher must have access and rich access to means to make that possible.

No politician should bar the way of a teacher to helping a student learn by banning multi-cultural education or even Afrocentric education, but that doesn't mean that this way is the right way for every student.

The teacher working on behalf of the students in the school, the teachers working together as a community to support students in a given school should be very, very analytical about how to advance learning and all the students assigned there, all the students who are members of that community, and I don't want to be oversimplistic either, but I do want to say that it worries me that we would rush to say, okay, Afrocentrism for everybody or all-boy academies for all African-American males, I think that would be unfortunate, but for those that would benefit from this approach to instruction, it ought to be provided.

Chairman OWENS. Can we expect some established recommended protocols and regimens that have been demonstrated to have worked and that they would be available so that they can be replicated widely?

Ms. ROBINSON. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. We can expect that in certain areas?

Ms. ROBINSON. I think that is right, yes. Also, it is important to note that when you bring different forms of practice into these schools, you change very important dynamics. When you bring cooperative learning or active learning into a school, you must change your definition of order fast because if order means quiet, if order means chairs in a row, you are not going to have active learning.

We have found active learning to be a very important instructional strategy for all students, but perhaps—most especially for students who are at risk. Student-centered learning where students are encouraged to ask their own questions and find themselves nurtured in an environment where the teacher and fellow students encourage them in pursuit of that answer, this might look quite chaotic to someone who has a traditional view of classroom management. So we have to be willing to support teachers to implement these new practices in ways that might really cause us some anxiety because our vision of order is quiet and straight rows and our vision of learning is high scores on a standardized test.

Well, the test might not come close to matching what a student knows when in fact it is more important to recognize what that student knows and have that be a foundation for the next challeng-

ing question that they dare ask of themselves to struggle and find the answer.

Chairman OWENS. Will there be a definite territory established for OERI as being responsible for research and development, and I think part of the process of having the administrators and the practitioners relate to findings and make use of them will depend on the status that the agency is able to establish and maintain.

I have been very concerned about this, and I think that Mr. Obey on the Appropriations Committee is also a person who is very knowledgeable about the process of vulcanization of research and development within the Department of Education, and together we did take some steps to put language into the appropriations bill requiring that there be an effort made by the Department of Education to really bring together research and development under OERI and proceed in a more unified way in its overall effort.

I read from your testimony that that is proceeding. I hope that we can be helpful in that process, but we think it is vitally necessary. Would you care to comment? You don't have to comment.

Ms. ROBINSON. No I would appreciate an opportunity to say that the kind of change that you have proposed and put forth and the vision for OERI is very new. It says that that agency has to serve everybody. There are constituencies that are not accustomed to coming to OERI for anything.

We have now an opportunity to interact with the bilingual community with the special ed community with the child educators on those serving children with various kinds of exceptional needs to establish ourselves as credible in the interests of the children that they have devoted a great deal of energy and interest to protect.

I think that we are ready to seize that opportunity and to act on it in a very positive way. I hope that through our coordination function, I hope that through our administrative responsibilities, that we will demonstrate that we are worthy of that expectation and that we have met that challenge.

There will be resistance to the idea of having an agency serve everybody when folks are used to having their own corner of the world to play in, but I suspect very strongly that a lot of what has been learned in special ed research about how to manage with individual student plans, how to integrate students in various kinds of learning environments would be quite beneficial to general education teachers. I suspect that much of what has been learned in bilingual education would be beneficial to others in the education community.

We have to find a way to merge knowledge because in fact it is at the edges where disciplines interact that the next generation of innovation will occur. So to the extent that we permit the vulcanization to continue, we compromise our capacity to be on the leading edge, on the cutting edge, but we have to work very hard to make a place where all these communities of interest can in fact interact with a great deal of confidence with mutual respect and with an understanding that we all bring something to the table that is quite valuable and should not be squandered.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. One last question. I will let go most of my lists, since I have made them to you. I was impressed and I think that maybe our government should have been embar-

rassed by the announcement of Mr. Attenberg that he was going to make available $500 million for research and innovation, school improvement, et cetera.

You know, considering the short shrift that has been given to research and development here in Washington to have the private sector come forward with that kind of offer, and it is going forward, it has an impact out there, and I wondered is there any linkage, any liaison with the Attenberg effort.

In my city there is a lot of talk about using it to set up charter schools and some other things. I just wonder is there any coordination with your office or any other office within the Department of Education with the Attenberg mega private sector initiative?

Ms. ROBINSON. We have had a number of conversations orchestrated primarily through the Secretary's office about our mutual interests in the sites and so forth that might benefit from this money.

One important feature of these conversations has to do with our capacity to document this systemic reform phenomenon, this activity that is abroad must be captured in some kind of disciplined database that we can learn from over time and we can learn from in fact while we are in the process.

That has been the focus of most conversations that I have had, and I think that that is a very important conversation to continue.

It would be very unfortunate if we were not struggling to understand and get agreement on what kind of data we collect to examine this process of systemic reform, whether the sponsor is in the private sector or Goals 2000 at the State and local level, so that is an issue that represents a real urgent matter for us and we are pursuing with a lot of vigor.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you very much, Madam Secretary, you have a herculean task. We look forward to cooperating with you as you move forward.

We are going to have a panel of three experts, and then we are going to have some more comments from the audience and if you care to stay, we will certainly forward those recommendations and comments to you. Thank you very much for being here.

STATEMENTS OF DR. EDMUND W. GORDON, DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION PSYCHOLOGY, CITY COLLEGE, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK; JAMES McPARTLAND, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOLS, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE, MD; AND BEVERLY J. WALKER, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY, OAK BROOK, ILLINOIS

Chairman OWENS. Our next panel consists of Dr. Edmund Gordon, Distinguished Professor of Educational Psychology, City College, City University of New York; Dr. James McPartland, Director of the Center for the Social Organization of Schools at Johns Hopkins University; and Dr. Beverly J. Walker, Deputy Director, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Oak Brook, Illinois.

Dr. Walker I would like bring to you greetings from a Member of our Education and Labor Committee and this subcommittee, Mr. Fawell, who couldn't be here today, but wanted to let you know that he would like to welcome you to this forum.

Ms. WALKER. Thank you.

Chairman OWENS. I would like to note the fact that a group of students that just came in, I think they are from Medgar Evers College in my district and Medgar Evers College has the distinction of being a junior college which has now been distinguished by the State as a senior college. Enrollment jumped from I think 3,000 to 5,000 over the last two years and some great things have been happening there.

We would like to welcome Dr. Bentley and the Medgar Evers students who are visiting here for the day as part of the legislative weekend. I wish they could stay for more than a day, but they will be here for one day. Welcome.

This is a hearing on the startup of the restructured Office of Education and Research and Improvement, and we are particularly concerned about a recently established or legislated institute on the education of at-risk students.

I want to welcome all three of our panelists. We have copies of your testimony. Please feel free to say anything you want to say to highlight your testimony or other matters, and we will have further discussion in the question and answer period.

We will begin with Dr. Gordon.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you. Good morning Congressman. I want to express my appreciation to Congressman Owens and other distinguished Members of this committee for the privilege of testifying this morning.

My testimony is fairly specifically directed at the new center for research on children placed at risk. I will make a few kind of orienting comments with respect to the work of that center. I have some specific recommendations as I was requested to make with respect to the work of that center and I will end with a few general recommendations for the implementation of the legislation that provides for the creation of the several centers.

The substitute for children placed at risk and this major center has a kind of bifocal concern which requires a lot of thought. At the heart of these concerns are the characteristics, conditions, the functioning of persons who themselves have been placed at risk. Another part of it has to do with the context in which their development gets played out, whether it be schools, communities, or homes.

But the way in which we approach these two sets of questions importantly relates to the way in which we conceptualize the problem itself.

In my testimony, I call attention to our conception that we need to distinguish between earlier conceptions of risk status and emerging conceptions. Traditionally in our society we have thought of risk status as being defined or influenced primarily by the characteristics of persons who have one or another developmental or accidental handicaps: Blindness, for instance, mental defects, physical defects.

We are increasingly recognizing that in addition to those characteristics of persons, there are characteristics of circumstance that place persons at risk such as poverty, such as racism, such as political powerlessness, and a program of research that addresses this

population will have to move away from the earlier conception of risk status to this new and broader conception of risk status.

In both the summary prepared remarks and in the more extended set of remarks that I have made available, we talk about a variety of kinds of human capital such as health capital, the importance that health status, health condition plays in the development in a group of persons who have been deprived of health capital and are therefore placed at risk by our society that doesn't compensate for it.

We iterate a number of kinds of such capital. Another rather interesting one, particularly for the population that some of us are—the populations that some of us are particularly concerned with is something we call polity capital, that is membership, a sense that these people belong in the community, the sense that these people have a role to play in the community.

We are beginning to recognize that folks who do not share polity capital and do not have access to it are obviously placed at risk of failure because in modern technological societies, the lack of either capacity to or opportunity to participate in the—to meaningfully participate in the affairs of society places one at risk.

Anyway, in thinking about the work of the new center, one needs to make a place for the kind of research that examines the characteristics of persons, the conditions of persons, the context of persons, as well as the institutions that serve them.

Such a research center might well focus its attention on three broad categories of activities. One I will call basic and applied research. Here we think about studies that focus on understanding and fostering educational resilience among children. What are the aspects of persons' behavior and what are the characteristics of institutions that enable people to overcome or to show resilience in the face of factors that interfere with their development.

Actually I prefer the term defiance to resilience. It is a title that I take from a book I am currently completing on persons who defy negative predictions for success and what we are trying to understand there is what is it about the behaviors of these persons and about the context in which their behaviors develop, the institutions that serve them, the families and communities from which they come that enable them to defy poverty, that enable them to defy health risk factors, that enable them to defy the negative implications of racism.

A second area of research for the center is something I would call collaboration in relation to policy and practice. Secretary Robinson has called attention to the important new direction in the Department of Education of higher sensitivity to the consumers for our research.

Now, in thinking about these consumers, it is important to recognize that we are more sensitive to their needs and at the same time likely to be better informed with respect to important research issues. If they are partners with, if they are collaborators with those of us who serve them and those of us who generate research in their interests, that research should inform public policy in relation to these populations. It should also inform professional practice so that the center ought to have a bifocal orientation here. Some of its work is more conceptual in the sense that it looks down

the road to try to determine how these ideas, how these ways of doing things, how these findings influence policy decisions.

But the other piece which is equally important is how these ideas, how these findings work in practice. A couple of the questions you were raising with respect to some definitive answers, I think the Secretary was quite correct in suggesting that she didn't want to lead you to believe that we were going to provide very definitive and absolute answers to very specific questions, but rather a contextual, a conceptual frame in which those issues can be addressed.

Now, this is particularly important when we are dealing with human services like education and health. The interaction between the various variables that are involved in any developing life are such that one wants to be able to be adaptive, a solution that may fit or may not. We can best understand the tradition of modern medicine where we are now prescribing drugs very sensitively, very creatively, very adaptively to patients depending upon their diagnosed needs and the constant monitoring of their response to them, so this collaboration between a person served and the persons who are studying or serving is an important feature.

And the third is an aggressive outreach program that builds on existing structures for the dissemination of information and for its utilization. I think that the center and the institute could well model some of its activities after the practices of the old agricultural extension agent where the effort was taking two people who had the practical problems of farming, you know, the technical knowledge that was being generated in the university, and not simply handing it to them in a pamphlet, but getting out on their farm with them with hands-on technical assistance. I could see a variety of approaches to the dissemination of information including hands-on technical assistance as being a third category of the program.

Now, in my prepared remarks I have got about 10 different recommendations that are fairly specific to the research program for the institute. If you would like for me to get into those, I certainly will. They speak more specifically to issues of resilience, defiance, of risk status, the examination of institutional characteristics that serve them, particularly important is the focus on people who make it as well as people who fail.

Much of the research, particularly on minority and other so-called at-risk populations, has documented their failures. We would want to call attention to the fact that there are some folk who do overcome, who do beat the odds, who do defy being placed at risk. What are their characteristics, what are their circumstances?

My final remarks are four recommendations I would like to make in general with respect to the implementation of the legislation which created the institutes.

Now, the first of these is that attention be given to the inclusion of a wide range and variety of intelligency represented in the Nation and required for adequate knowledge production. Basically what I am suggesting there is that we follow a model that the office is to be complimented for, that is the Department of Education is to be complimented for in the competition on the at-risk center.

For the first time in the history of my knowledge of the history of the Department of Education and the old Office of Education, in

a major competition, we have attracted some of the ablest social scientists in the country, but we have also attracted in that pool of competitors a good representation of the ethnic, cultural, gender diversity of the country.

The Secretary is to be complimented here because that effort has been so broadly inclusive that if I am right in my estimate of who the competitors are in that competition, any one of them could win and we would still have represented excellence with respect to human intellect, scholarship, and diversity with respect to the population represented in that pool of people. I think that effort certainly needs to be continued as we move on to the other institutes.

The second recommendation has to do with attention to the real problems that flow from the lived experiences of diverse people in the Nation. Much of the tradition of behavioral science research in this country is marked by our focus either on the judgments that some of us who are removed from the problem make about what the problem is or the theoretically conceived notions about the problem or about a particular population and are often not grounded in the experiences of the people who are actually being studied.

Clearly whether we are talking about the new institute for children at risk or the institute, I think it is on teaching and learning, whatever the institute is, I would recommend that serious attention be given to grounding that research in the problems of real people.

However, since they are research efforts, we don't want to be so specific in our direction to them, we don't want to be so mission oriented, as it were, that we circumscribe the opportunity for the posing of questions by the institutions that are conducting the research work.

Here we are faced with a kind of tension between unfettered inquiry and mission-oriented work. And somehow in the selection and the administration and the implementation of this legislation, I am arguing we have got to be respectful of that tension. There are missions to be served, but we also don't want to define those missions so sharply that we are limiting the responsibility and the opportunity of researchers to search quite broadly and freely.

That would mean that would lead to my third recommendation, and that is that somehow provision be made for the accommodation and encouragement of the maverick, the unusual person. Again, if we look at the tradition of work, particularly as it relates to minority folk, some of us whose notions have grown out of particular experiences that may be different from the hegemonic values in the society have been thought of as maverick folk and we have not had our work supported. A good example of this is my colleague from Yale Jim Coleman. For many years Jim's work was more or less ignored because he was somehow thought to be a little bit off—out of the mainstream. And I must say, Congressman Owens, I don't want to be one of those people who sees racism everywhere, but I sometimes think that Jim's ethnicity also got in the way.

But we are now beginning to recognize the importance of that work that he has been doing. Whatever structure we create for these institutes, it has got to accommodate the maverick. It has got to accommodate the diversity of interests, of concerns, of approaches to knowledge production that are available to us.

And the last recommendation has to do with the protection and encouragement of persistence and continuity. So much of the research community in education has been episodically funded, has been subject to fad. Much of the work is cut off or unsupported when the leadership changes. That is not going to solve the kind of problems that we are concerned with here.

Somehow we have got to have structures that enable long-term investment in important problems that provide for continuity that protect persistence at the same time that we have the kind of review procedures that do permit us to cut off stuff that is clearly unproductive, clearly going in the wrong direction. But when we turn to that protection, we have got to remember that we run the risk of aborting—of violating the recommendation I just made, and that is that we somehow have got to be able to protect the maverick work.

Thank you.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. With today's voters, Congressmen need answers in two years, Senators in six years.

[The prepared statement of Edmund W. Gordon follows:]

Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights, Washington, D.C. September 15, 1994.

Edmund W. Gordon

Distinguished Professor of Educational Psychology

City College, City University of New York

John H. Musser Professor of Psychology, Emeritus
Yale University

Visiting Scholar at the Children's Defense Fund
and
The College Entrance Examination Board

Congressman Owens and other distinguished members of the House Subcommittee on select Education and Civil Rights, thank you for the privilege of testifying concerning the implementation of the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994. My name is Edmund W. Gordon. I am the John H. Musser Professor of Psychology, Emeritus at Yale University and currently serve as Distinguished Professor of Educational Psychology at the City College and the Graduate School at the City University of New York. I am also a visiting scholar at the Children's Defense Fund and the College Entrance Examination Board. At the City University I am also the founding director of the Institute for Research on the African Diaspora in the Americas and the Caribbean, where major components of our research are focused on better understanding and improving the life chances of persons placed at risk of educational failure.

My testimony includes a brief introductory statement, recommendations concerning the Institute for Research on Students Placed at Risk, and a background paper which may serve to place in a fuller conceptual context, my recommendations relative to the Institute. The paper; "Cultural Dissonance as a Risk Factor in the Development of Students" is an adaptation of a chapter from a book which will soon be published by Teacher College Press.

The people of the United States are indebted to the distinguished Congressman, the Honorable Major Owens for his leadership in the passage of legislation which authorized the creation of a National Institute for Research on Children Placed at Risk of Educational failure. As you know, the competition for the designation of an institutional host

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sponsor of the Institute is now in its final stages. Fortunately, the Department of Education, with the help of some of us in the field, has ensured that the competing institutions include some of the nations most able behavioral science scholars and most of the competing institutions include among these scholars representatives of cultural, ethnic, gender and language groups that are over represented in the populations of persons placed at risk of educational failure. Consequently, no matter which institution is selected as host sponsor of the new Institute, we can be certain that there is a good chance that an appropriate complement of scholarly research and professional workers will be deploying attention to this important work.

In human social organization, when one's characteristics are at variance in significant ways from the modal characteristics of the social group that has achieved hegemony, one is likely to find little correspondence between the developmental supports provided by the dominant group and the developmental needs of the persons whose characteristics are different. This is a function of the operation of a principle of social economy whereby social orders design and allocate social resources in accord with the modal or otherwise valued characteristics of the social order. Thus we have schools, public facilities, media, and so on that are designed and allocated to fit the needs of persons whose vision and hearing are intact rather than to serve the needs of persons with sensory impairments. Consequently, persons with impairments in these sensory modalities are at-risk of developmental and educational failure, not necessarily as a function of the impairments but because the society is not organized to adequately support the developmental needs of persons whose characteristics are at variance with those that are modal. However, it is not alone persons whose developmental or personal characteristics may differ from those that are modal who are placed at risk of educational failure. Success in education in our society is highly correlated with access to several kinds of resource capital, and the distribution of these kinds of resource capital is unequal. Thus an additional factor which places populations at risk of educational failure is their deprivation of essential complements of resource capital. Miller (1994, in press) and Gordon (1992) have identified some of these categories of capital as:

Health capital - physical developmental integrity, health and nutritional condition, etc.

Financial capital - income and wealth, family, community and societal economic resources available for education.

Human capital - social competence, tacit knowledge and other education derived abilities as personal or family assets.

Social capital - social networks and relationships, social norms, cultural styles and values.

Polity capital - societal membership, social concern, public commitment, political/economy.

Personal capital - disposition, attitudes, aspirations, efficacy, sense of power.

Institutional capital - quality of and access to educating and socializing institutions.

Pedagogical capital - supports for appropriate educational treatment in family, school, and community.

A view of adaptation as an active exchange between the individual and his or her environment warrants a change in the terminology used to denote positive outcomes in the face of risk of failure. The term resilience refers to the ability to bounce back into shape; to recover strength or spirit. Although theoretical models of resilience have attempted to delineate some of the active manners in which individuals cope with experiential challenges, the term itself does not capture the relative amount of strength and determination which individuals must utilize in evaluating their circumstances and controlling their destinies. We feel that the term "defiance" captures better the processual phenomena under study. In my work defiance of the prediction of failure is used as a possibly more valid construct to refer to the resilience phenomenon sometimes noted in persons who overcome being placed at risk of failure by their conditions of life. The perspective and resulting research that current definitions of "resilience" engender reflect the notion that events and experiences which are objectively assigned negative valence constitute experiential hazards, and that it is these hazards which place the developing person at risk of educational failure.

But the meaning of personal and ecological characteristics does not adhere simply to the characteristics themselves, but to the person's appraisal of the meaning and significance of those characteristics. Similarly, environmental factors are not intrinsically protective or stress-inducing, but rather depend on the person's attributional representation of the environment and on his or her appraisal of personal abilities, dispositions and resources to regulate and adapt to the environmental demands posed (Lazarus, DeLongis, Folkman, & Gruen, 1985; Magnusson

citation). Individuals actively construct personal realities (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Cantor, Mischel, & Schwartz, 1982), or working models which serve as scripts for behavior (Schank & Abelson, 1977). Such positions as these are supported by data from prior studies by the investigator (Gordon and Song, 1994) Gordon and Braithwaite, 1985) which indicate that the actions of resilient individuals are guided first by how they perceive and interpret their environments. These beliefs then form the basis for purposeful, planned, actions undertaken to move away from or compensate for negative circumstances and toward more adaptive end states. For example, poverty - a common "risk" factor noted in resilience research - was not perceived by many of the participants in our studies as an inevitable obstacle to success, but rather as a challenge to be counteracted. In some instances, the condition was not perceived as such, for example, subjects reported that "we never thought of our family as poor." Additionally, it is not the case that social supports were immediately available to our subjects, instead many actively searched out, established, and maintained favorable situations or good interpersonal relationships that helped them access other resources necessary for personal achievement. What seems to be missing from existing theoretical models of resilience is a concern with these existential processes that explain defiant behavior. Thus it is that we seek to identify the "reality" and existential characteristics which are correlates of persons who defy the usual negative consequences of being placed at risk of developmental and educational failure - the resilient ones, we call defiers.

Understanding the circumstances, consequences, and resilience from and/or defiance of being placed at risk of educational failure is essential to the improvement of life chances for children who have been placed at risk. More complete knowledge of the risk condition as well as of those who show resilience in the face of risk is necessary to inform the production of new knowledge, the development of related public policy, the generation of improved professional practice, and the making of personal choices. There is, consequently, great need for research which is designed to address several questions referable to being placed at risk of educational failure, and to the prevention, compensation for, and defiance of the negative consequences of children's being placed at such risk. Since being placed at risk, and defiance or resilience in the face of risk are complex phenomena, programs of research must be directed at understanding this complexity and desegregating the interacting components of the conditions of risk, of educational failure associated with such risk, and of the defiant or resilient behavior in some persons placed at risk.

Recommendations:

The research, development and disemmination program of the National Institute for Research on Students Placed at Risk of Educational Failure should address three programatic initiatives:

a) Studies on fostering educational resilience among children and youth placed in at-risk circumstances through improved services provided by the schools and related human service insticutions, as well as through strengthened connections between families, schools, and communities;

b) Broadly framed, research-based, community-initiated intervention programs for achieving a high standard of educational outcomes of all children and youth in economically disadvantaed rural and urban communities; and

c) An aggressive outreach progras that builds on existing structures for dissemination and utilization of information and practice to ensure that the work of the Institute is known and its findings and products are useful and utilized in efforts to achieve educational excellence for all of this nation's children and youth.

In the program and work of the new Institute for Research on Students Placed At Risk of Educational Failure I recommend that special attention be given to such questions as the following.

1. What are the personal, ecological and existential correlates of success and failure in persons placed at risk of educational underdevelopment?

2. What are the differential patterns in these correlates in different populations, such as: African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic or Latin Americans, Native Americans, low income and middle income persons in these populations, and in elementary, middle school and high school students?

3. What are the mechanisms (nature and how it works) and meanings of being placed at risk of educational failure?

4. What are the differences in the contemporary and intergenerational developmental experiences and needs of, and consequences for, children and adolescents who have been placed at risk of educational failure?

5. How can we separate the contributions of low ethnic and low income status to being placed at risk of failure

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and to the defiance of such placement? Are the roles of poverty and racism different?

6. What are the institutional correlates (conditions and characteristics) of resilient institutions and institutions which enable resilience in students?

7. What are the identifiable degrees of at risk status as reflected in the continuum from failure, through underachievement to high degrees of success; (We are concerned here with being able to explain developmental patterns which do not reflect outright failure but do reflect impaired progress which, in the absence of having been placed at risk, would likely have reached higher achievement - underachieving "able and gifted" minority students are examples of the students referred to here.)?

8. In what specific ways do our research findings inform the continuing development of pedagogical theory, the formulation of educational policy, and the improvement of educational practice?

9. How can we identify and describe the home, community and school factors and conditions which are associated with children who successfully overcome being placed at risk of educational failure; (What are the characteristics of those nurturing, protective and healing environments? For what categories of students do which environments work and for whom do they fail?)

10. What are the factors which are associated with families and schools which have experienced resilience in the face of high risk of educational failure?

CULTURAL DISSONANCE AS A RISK FACTOR IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS

Edmund W. Gordon
Distinguished Professor of Educational Psychology
City College, City University of New York
and
John M. Musser Professor of Psychology, Emeritus
Yale University

In human social organization, when one's characteristics are at variance in significant ways from the modal characteristics of the social group that has achieved hegemony, one is likely to find little correspondence between the developmental supports provided by the dominant group and the developmental needs of the persons whose characteristics are different. This is a function of the operation of a principle of social economy whereby social orders design and allocate social resources in accord with the modal or otherwise valued characteristics of the social order. Thus we have schools, public facilities, media, and so on that are designed and allocated to fit the needs of persons whose vision and hearing are intact rather than to serve the needs of persons with sensory impairments. Consequently, persons with impairments in these sensory modalities are at-risk of developmental and educational failure, not necessarily as a function of the impairments but because the society is not organized to adequately support the developmental needs of persons whose characteristics are at variance with those that are modal. However, it is not alone persons whose developmental or personal characteristics may differ from those that are modal who are placed at risk of educational failure. Success in education in our society is highly correlated with access to several kinds of resource capital, and the distribution of these kinds of resource capital is unequal. Thus an additional factor which places populations at risk of educational failure is their deprivation of essential complements of resource capital. Miller (1994, in press) and Gordon (1992) have identified some of these categories of capital as:

Health capital - physical developmental integrity, health and nutritional condition, etc.

Financial capital - income and wealth, family, community and societal economic resources available for education.

Human capital - social competence, tacit knowledge and other education derived abilities as personal or family assets.

Social capital - social networks and relationships, social norms, cultural styles and values.

Polity capital - societal membership, social concern, public commitment, political/economy.

Personal capital - disposition, attitudes, aspirations, efficacy, sense of power.

Institutional capital - quality of and access to educating and socializing institutions.

Pedagogical capital - supports for appropriate educational treatment in family, school, and community.

Following this line of reasoning, the identification of a population as being at-risk of failure is always situational and relative. In its early usage, "at risk" status was used to refer to persons with identifiable sensory, physical, or intellectual disabilities that were likely to result in their failure to benefit from the normal range of developmental resources generally available. Their risk of failure was related to the goals or objectives the society expected most children to achieve even in the absence of specialized resources, and the implicit recognition that without such resources, expected achievement was unlikely. It is in the latter half of the current century that we began to think of persons as being "at-risk" of failure to achieve an adequate education because of their social circumstances.

This shift in emphasis from one class of indicators to another may be a reflection of 1) a decline in the relative number of persons with mental, physical, and sensory disabilities; 2) the society's enhanced capacity to address the problems of these groups; 3) an increase in the numbers of persons whose social status and access to resource capital place them at a disadvantage in the society, and the increasing recognition of the society's lack of success in meeting the developmental needs of this newly recognized group.

In the identification of populations of children placed at-risk of failure to be adequately developed or educated, it is important that both the old and the new categories of persons be included. It is also important, that we recognize the special at-risk status of persons who are doubly or triply placed at-risk, i.e., those who fall into two or three of the at-risk categories. An example of such a person is a language minority group member who is female, hard of hearing, and black. For the purposes of our discussions, however, these will be treated as extreme cases, and the more common patterns

of at-risk status will be our focus.

Traditionally, at-risk status has referenced the characteristics of the persons so designated. Typical of this approach is Rosehan's (1967) list of attributes of "at-risk" students:

1. They commonly come from broken homes;
2. They are nonverbal and concrete-minded;
3. They are physically less healthy than their middle-class peers;
4. They lack stable identification figures or role models;
5. They lack stable community ties because of their constant migration;
6. They are often handicapped by their color, which provides them with a negative self-image;
7. They are handicapped in the expression and comprehension of language;
8. They tend to be extroverted rather than introverted.

However, it may be useful to utilize a more dynamic conception of the construct. We hold that at-risk status refers not simply to the characteristics of persons, but to an interaction between the traits of such persons and the contexts in which they live their lives. Being at-risk of failure may be an iatrogenic condition, i.e., it may be more appropriately conceptualized as a condition or circumstance brought on by the failure or incapacity of the developmental environment to support the needs of the developing person. Consider the fact that all persons who show the characteristics that we have targeted do not show other evidences of being at-risk. All persons for whom English is a second language or who claim African American identity or who have a physical disability do not flounder. In fact, some such persons have relatively uneventful courses of development and achieve quite adequately. In our work (e.g. Gordon and Song, 1992), we have found that many such persons develop in environments that have been specially structured to ensure that appropriate supports are available and that incapacitating barriers are eliminated or circumvented. We conclude that at-risk status is a function of the inappropriateness of developmental environments to the needs of the person and that a focus on these deficient environments may be more productive than a focus on the characteristics of the persons. We can then define at-risk as referring to a category of persons whose personal characteristics, conditions of life and situational circumstances, in interactions one with the other, make it likely that the development of such persons, the educational experiences to which they are exposed, and the quality of educational achievement will be less than optimal. Such

persons are more appropriately referred to as having been placed at risk of developmental and educational failure.

To better understand the interactions between these characteristics and life situations, it is important to make still another distinction. Gordon (1988) distinguishes between the status and functional characteristics of persons. Status characteristics like ethnicity, gender, class, and language generally define one's status in the social order. Status is likely to influence one's access to resources, the nature of one's opportunities and rewards, what is expected, as well as the character and quality of society's investment in one's development. Functional characteristics refer to the "hows" of behavior and generally refer to the ways in which persons function. Functional characteristics, often culturally determined, include belief systems, cognitive style, dispositions, language systems, mores, skills, and technologies (ways of doing things). Obviously there are interactions and overlap between status and functional characteristics, but either set of traits can facilitate or frustrate development and education by virtue of it's primary characteristics. However, there is a secondary characteristic that adheres to each category that may be of greater consequence for development than is the influence of status on the distribution of resources or the influence of function on the organization of behavior. We refer to the personal identification and attribution processes that derive from one's status as well as from one's way of functioning. Both help to define one's concept of self and the manner in which one identifies one's self. Ultimately, even though status and functional characteristics may be the developmental antecedents of identity, it may be identity that provides the energy behind behavioral adaptation. How then do human characteristics in interaction with social circumstances influence the development of identity, and what is the relationship between sources of one's identity and one's being at-risk of developmental and educational failure to thrive? We submit that culture is the context and the ubiquitous vehicle.

Culture and Human Development

Psychologists and anthropologists such as Cole, Gay, Glick, and Sharp (1971), have concluded that regardless of cultural, ethnic, gender, or class differences among human groups, there are no corresponding differences in cognitive and affective processes. Rather, it is held that the basic processes of mentation in the human species are common—e.g. association, recall, perception, inference, discrimination, etc.—and it is the prior experiences, situations, and

meanings that form the context for the development and expression of these processes. Because experiences, situations, and meanings are culturally determined, the quality of the development of a process, the conditions under which it is expressed, and even our ability to recognize its manifestations are dependent upon cultural phenomena that are often mediated through ethnic, gender, or class identity.

Our conception of risk factors offers an example of the importance of discussing the culturally embedded nature of human experience and meaning. In the past, we have framed our conception of at-risk status or vulnerability in terms of risk factors, such as gender, demographic status, social and intellectual resources, genetic history, mobility patterns, and negative or traumatic life events. What we have not accounted for in this conception of at-risk status is the fact that over half of the individuals who may experience the most severe stressors do not report psychological or social dysfunction (Waxman et al., 1992). Gordon, Rollock, and Miller (1990) have suggested that threats to the integrity of behavioral development and adaptation may exist along a continuum, with the degree of threat better defined by existential meaning than by "reality" factors; the individual's reaction to the threat may depend upon the actual perception or the connotation that is permitted by the context in which the phenomenon is experienced.

It is becoming clear, then, that culture is a construct with a wide variety of definitions and conceptions. Authors have often sought to distinguish between material and non-material aspects of culture. Belief systems, attitudes, and attributions are examples of non-material culture, while tools, skills, and artifacts serve as examples of material culture. We hold however, that at its core culture is responsible for all human behavior. That is, when we speak of culture, we are speaking of both the cause and the product of human affect and cognition.

Both Geertz (1973) and Tyler (1949) have provided us with widely accepted indices and definitions for culture. In his perception of culture, Tyler (1949) included "knowledge, beliefs, art, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society," while Geertz viewed culture as an "historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbolic form by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life" (p. 89). We see then, an effort to discuss culture in terms of objects or tools as well as language and shared conceptual schemata. In joining these perceptions of culture, we can derive five fundamental

dimensions of the construct:

1. The judgmental or normative is a reflection of society's standards and values, which often provides the constraints within which thought is facilitated;
2. The cognitive dimension consists of categories of mentation (such as social perceptions, conceptions, attribution, and connotations) that are often expressed through language;
3. The affective dimension refers to the emotional structure of a social unit and its common feelings, sources of motivation, and so on;
4. The skill dimension relates to those special capabilities the members of a culture develop in order to meet the demands of their social and techno-economic environment (Ogbu, 1978);
5. The technological dimension refers not only to different or more highly developed technological practices, but more importantly it refers to the impact of the different information inherent in these practices on cognitive and affective behaviors;

These dimensions serve to emphasize those characteristics by which a culture may be identified or by which the culture of a group may be characterized. It is in this descriptive definition of culture that we begin to see the reference points for one's social or group identity, as well as the experiences that provide a context for one's conception of his or her own (as well as others') patterns of behavior.

The function of culture in human activity, however, does not end with its role as a descriptive concept. In addition to providing the referents for group identity, culture also provides the stimuli and the consequences of human behavioral patterns. Thus, culture also serves as an explanatory construct. As mentioned earlier, when we discuss cultural information in terms of description, we are articulating the status phenomenon of culture, and in general are referring both to the social identity of individuals (Goffman, 1963)—the group to which I belong—as well as describing the effect of this identity on an individual's access to resources. When we seek to explain behavior, however, and discuss the influence of one's personal identity—the group to which I feel that I belong—we begin to wonder how particular language and belief systems, specific objects and tools, not to mention technological advances, influence or enable the behavior of individuals. When we examine ways of thinking—such as linear and sequential thought, tendency to generate abstractions, field dependence and independence, connotations and taxonomies as

well as allowable metaphors—we are becoming aware of culture as a vehicle for cognition. Ultimately, culture provides the constraints within which mentation and affect are enabled.

Furthermore, culture serves as a mediator for learning in two fundamental respects. According to Vygotsky's notions of cognitive development, learning occurs within social interaction. That is, in contrast to the Piagetian conception of self-constructed knowledge, Vygotsky (1978) argued that the development of higher psychological functions is rooted in children's primary social interactions. Learning, based on the cultural-historical theory, consists of three fundamental activities: transmission of knowledge and cognitive skills, cultivation of cognitive abilities, and the encouragement of these cognitive abilities. According to this conception, knowledge in one's culture is socially transmitted by adults and capable peers to children. The adult or capable peer, in joint activity, serves as a role model or expert tutor on a task that allows for cognitive processes to be demonstrated and then practiced and learned. New cognitive abilities emerge as the adult works with the child on tasks that may have originally been too demanding for the child. As the pair work in collaboration, with the adult providing encouragement as well as appropriate feedback, the child gradually begins to take on the responsibility of the task. While initiating the activity within the child's "zone of proximal development," with time, the adult begins to remove support as the child becomes more competent at the task. It is in this form of social scaffolding that we see the mechanism for growth and development in cognitive functioning.

We can not overstate the importance of an individual's group and personal identity in the social interaction that comprises the learning process. A secondary human characteristic to status and functional characteristics, one's sense of self—mediated by culture—provides the fuel for the social interaction inherent in learning behavior. It is not only through cultural encounters that human cognition develops, but it is also through these same social interactions that we begin to recognize and identify our identity. Culture provides the reference points that allow me to recognize myself not only in terms of my gender, class, and ethnicity, but also to acknowledge that I am separate from others. It is this complex sense of self that I bring to the classroom, that must in turn be met and integrated into the dynamic culture of the learning environment in order for optimal development to occur. This interaction between self and the learning environment is dialectical in nature: Not only will the learning process enable me to grow and change in fundamental ways, but my

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

development will clearly impact on the culture of the learning environment.

On the micro level, the socio-cultural context is mediated through personal social interactions. It is here, in teaching interactions that take the form of social scaffolding, that learners develop a system of knowledge structures and affective cognitive skills that are congruent with the values, beliefs, and conventions of their socio-cultural group. The interaction between learner and significant other is premised on reciprocity. While it provides the learner with the opportunity to develop personal attributions, dispositions, and motivations to behave in essentially appropriate ways, the growth of the learner creates new demands for the tutor.

Ultimately, it is the social institution that may come to replace or function in parallel with the significant other, both as a source of reinforcement and a vehicle for the normative dimension of culture. It is through the processes of assimilation, accommodation, and adaptation of schemata, that cultural transmission occurs. Schematization represents the mechanism by which conceptual structures come to represent cognitive, conative, and affective components of phenomena experienced. In accommodation, then, the acquisition and replication of stimulus/response/situation triads is related to existing schemata, while, in adaptation, the existing schemata or emerging conceptual frames are adapted to the demands of currently perceived or changing conditions.

It is in the relationship between social institutions and the learner that high degrees of dissonance can result in failure to learn or a distortion of the learning process. In a society with tremendous cultural diversity and a culturally hegemonic educational system, dissonance between what is learned in personal interaction with the significant other often may come into conflict with demands and expectations of the social institution. Precision of language offers an example of such dissonance. It is not uncommon in some cultures for individuals to use signal words to represent deeper meanings rather than the elaborated language we have come to associate with the academy. In some groups, numbers and time are evoked in the form of estimation rather than the precise calculations and specific references used in high-technology-dominated cultures. In the context of an educational system that allows only for the precision of exact calculation, i.e., that does not appreciate the potential for cultural differences in the ways that number are used, this demand for exactness may place a child at risk of failure to thrive in the school setting.

It should be understood that while some cultures may place a greater emphasis on technological development than other cultures, the notion of a "culturally deprived" people is a misnomer. The challenge for education thus becomes the enabling of bridging between cultures, of the learning of multiple cultures, and the appreciation of multiple ways of viewing things in all students.

It is the failure or inability of the school to bridge between cultures that are in conflict that renders schooling a risk-inducing phenomenon for many students. Since learning is such a personal achievement, it is critically dependent upon the learner's engagement in the process. When the learning process comes to be associated with that which is "not me," that which is alien to me, learning task engagement is interfered with. E.T. Gordon (1992) has described what he calls "resistant culture," to refer to the sometimes elaborate systems of belief and behavior adopted by African-American males to insulate themselves from the demands of acculturation and socialization experiences that they consider alien or hostile to their interests. Some of these adaptations serve pro-social ends. Others are clearly anti-social. In both instances, however, they represent defense mechanisms for the youth and barriers to intervention. Given the ineptness of much that we do for these youth and the actual destructiveness of some of our actions, these adaptations can not be rejected. Rather they must be understood and taken into account as intervention plans are developed. In the absence of such respect, alienation and resistance in the face of cultural conflict must be expected.

It is these instances of cultural conflict that are so challenging and frustrating in the design of educational services for children who are at-risk. Educators who are sensitive to the diversity of at-risk children should be respectful of their indigenous orientations and values, but these are sometimes at odds with the goals toward which education is directed. If it were simply a matter of cultural taste, the choices would be simpler even if the implementation might not be. However, in some circumstances, what we are dealing with are resistant cultural values that are politically functional but developmentally dysfunctional. Decisions concerning the quality of educational pursuits and the choice of more challenging courses are examples. For some time now we have taken the position that the educator has a professional responsibility to make these hard choices for the student, when the student's risk status renders him or her incapable of making an informed decision. In such cases, the final criterion must be the increasing of options for the student. If the

professionally made choice reduces future alternatives for the student, we feel that it is probably not in his or her best interest. If it increases alternatives for choice, we feel that the professional has the responsibility to act to reduce the risk factors which have been incidentally, accidentally or deliberately placed in the developmental path of the learner.

Implications for Educational Reform

Several implications for educational reform flow from this way of thinking about at-risk status. Among these are:

1. The limitations of reform in school governance alone;
2. The limitations of the manipulation of standards and accountability based upon educational achievement test data;
3. The applicability of principles of social justice; i.e., just savings and the needs of the weakest as bases for distributional inequalities;
4. The pedagogical principles of adaptability and complementarity;
5. Concern for diversity, pluralism, context, and perspective;

Limitations of Reform of School Governance

Most of the action on the school reform front has been directed at changes in the organizational structure and governance of schools. In a number of school systems across the nation, efforts are underway to increase teacher participation in decisions concerning what happens in schools. This notion rests on the logical conclusion that people are likely to work more effectively when they are pursuing goals and actions of their own choosing— when they feel some sense of ownership of the programs and projects in which they are engaged. The basic idea is consistent with related developments in the industrial sector and is thought to partially explain the reported differences between the productivity of Japanese and U.S. workers.

In what is perhaps the largest current effort to apply this concept, the public school system of Chicago has directed most of its reform efforts at the decentralization of governance and site-based management, despite a consent decree that requires that academic underachievement be reduced by 50% in five years (Gordon,1991). The implied logic here is probably based on the assumption that decentralization will result in more effective teaching and greater student learning. In this instance, the proceeds from an $83,000,000 court decree have been used to support schools that are actively working to implement site-based

management. The funds have been used in large measure to provide staff development in decision-making and management, as well as to provide modest support for curriculum enrichment. However, available achievement data do not yet suggest that the goal of 50% reduction in underachievement will be reached. (Gordon, 1991).

Site-based management seems to have become the current panacea for much that is considered to be wrong with schooling, despite the finding that such efforts to date have done more for teacher morale than for student achievement (Miami Study, 1990). Most advocates for this approach to school reform argue that real change can not occur without support from staff, and site-based management is the supposed route to such involvement and support. But active participation in the decision-making and management of schools requires more than authorization to participate. It requires know-how, resources, and societal commitment—none of which are in adequate supply. With respect to know-how, until we strengthen the pedagogical and substantive competence of our teaching force, their involvement in decision-making and school improvement is likely to be of limited effect. In addition, if the primary goal of many of our efforts at school reform is to reduce the incidence of school failure among those students who present very diverse characteristics to the school and who are currently served poorly by our schools, the current reforms in school governance hardly seem to be the treatment of choice.

Limitations of efforts at accountability and standards

Many of the states and certainly the federal government have staked their hopes for school reform and the improvement of education for children at-risk of failure on the imposition of higher standards of academic achievement and some attempts at establishing systems by which schools can be held accountable for their productivity. Now there is no question but that the standards by which we judge academic achievement and to which we consistently fail to hold schools accountable, are too low. They compare poorly to the standards achieved in other technologically advanced countries. However, it can be argued that our standards and achievement are low not simply because our sights are too low, but because our practice of and provision for education are inappropriate to the requirements of educational excellence. Among the most prominent efforts at goal and standard setting are the President's National Goals for Education and the non-government New Standards Project. Both have begun by devoting prime attention to the achievement outcomes of schooling. While for some the National Goals would be measured by a new educational achievement test, New

Standards proposes a new system of educational assessment. The latter is headed in the right direction with respect to assessment, but both give woefully little attention to the importance of educational inputs.

One cannot argue with the substance of the national education goals:

1. By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn;
2. By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent;
3. By the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter, including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy;
4. By the year 2000, U.S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement;
5. By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship (National Education Goals Panel, 1992).

In each instance, we have iterated a rational expectation of what will be required for meaningful, satisfying, and responsible participation in the social order. The values reflected in such goals, especially the third goal as listed above, send a powerful message to school systems across the country concerning what the nation expects from its schools. However, an extremely negative message is sent by the promulgation of such goals in the absence of the resources, know-how, and national commitment to ensure that schools and students are enabled to meet these goals. Nothing in the national effort speaks to the desperate need for staff development and the improvement of the quality of the labor force in schools. Nowhere in that effort is there attention given to the states' responsibility for ensuring that schools have the capacities to deliver the educational services necessary to the achievement of such goals. Nowhere is there any recognition of the things that must happen outside of schools to enable schools and students to reach these goals. Without attention to these extra-school forces, it is folly to expect that the national effort will address questions of responsibility for ensuring that these enabling conditions will prevail.

In the New York City Chancellor's Commission on Minimum

87-192 O - 95 - 3

Standards (Gordon, 1986), the case was made for the importance of symmetry in the pursuit of school accountability. After identifying achievement-level targets as standards, the Report proposed that standards also be set for professional practice and for institutional capacity. New York City, other school districts, the federal government, and New Standards have yet to seriously engage standards for practice and capacity. Yet if we are to expect that children at-risk of failure and other children as well will experience great improvements in their academic performance, it is more likely to come from holding to higher standards those of us who manage their education and guide their learning. In a forthcoming collection of essays entitled Standards of Excellence in Education (Gordon, 1992), Darling-Hammond has begun the iteration of an approach to such standards of practice and capacity. The problem is that it is relatively easy to arrive at agreement on what students should know and know how to do while it is very difficult to agree on what the educational inputs should be to achieve these aims without becoming overly prescriptive or without facing, what is more problematic politically, questions concerning entitlements and the fixing of responsibility for costs. If the field can ever agree on a set of standards for professional practice and school capability, do we then have a basis for asking the courts to hold schools or states responsible for making them available, especially to children at-risk of school failure?

Social Justice and Distributional Equity

As we turn to the actual distribution of educational resources, we encounter different kinds of problems. In his now classic report, Coleman (1966) challenged the society to separate school achievement from such social origins as class and race. The nation responded with several efforts directed at the equalization of educational opportunity. Enlightened as these efforts were and despite considerable expenditure of money and effort, educational achievement has continued to adhere to the social divisions by which status in our society is allocated. One of the reasons why this problem may be so recalcitrant is the confusion of distributional equality (ensuring that all have equal access to the educational resources of the society) and distributional equity, which requires that resources be distributed in proportion to need. Persons who need more educational resources cannot be said to have been treated with equity upon receiving an equal share, when what is needed is a share equal to their need. What is required here is a more appropriate conception of justice. Rawls (1971) has advanced a theory of justice in which the unequal distribution of social goods is justified by the principle of "just savings" through which the future claims of persons

as yet unborn are protected, and a second principle that holds acceptable unequal distribution of resources that favors the weakest members of the society. Our concern for resource distribution sufficient to the needs of persons most at-risk of failure meets one of Rawls' principles of social justice. Gordon and Shipman (1979) have argued that in the presence of students with widely diverse learning characteristics and conditions of life, standardized educational treatments may be dysfunctional. We may not be meeting the needs of student A when we provide for her the same educational treatment that we provide for student B, just as we do not provide for medical patients with different needs when we dispense the same medical treatments to both of them. Where there are groups of students known to present themselves at school without the acknowledged prerequisites for optimal learning, social justice requires that they be treated differently in order to serve their needs. We have begun to honor this notion in the court decision Lau v. Nichols (1974), which required that where there are certain concentrations of non-English speaking students, schools must provide some instruction in the student's first language. In such cases, the school's adaptation is to the language characteristics of the student. The courts have not yet extended this concept to include learning styles, cultural referents, temperament, temporal factors, or health/nutritional conditions. Yet if the needs of students who are at-risk are to be adequately (and equitably) served, those characteristics by which the school's inability to serve places them at-risk must be addressed. Without such adaptation, the values implicit in our conception of social justice and equity are not served.

Adaptability and complementarity as conditions of effective teaching and learning

If we recognize that children come to our schools with varying degrees of readiness for academic learning and differential patterns of support for educational pursuits, it is necessary that schools be adaptable to these different characteristics and circumstances as educators guide students toward the goals of schooling. When we add the fact that students have been differentially acculturated and socialized, giving them quite different cultural schemata, cultural styles, and related attitudes and dispositions, schools have the added task of developing the capacity to complement much of what students bring to school in the process of bridging from where these children are to where they will need to go in the process of gaining a sound, basic education and becoming effective adult members of society. In the service of adaptation, both our students and our schools must give and take as we try to reconcile differences between the worlds of home and school. In the

service of complementarity, the focus is on conserving the respective strengths of both students and schools as we construct connections (bridges) between the two. Complementarity assumes that beneath the surface differences that exist between groups and institutions, the basic human needs and goals are quite similar, and when made explicit, can be brought into facilitating and supportive relationships with one another. For example, my colleagues and I have been investigating the acquisition of higher-order thinking skills and strategies by inner-city high school students. After considerable effort at teaching such skills with little success at getting them to transfer what they had learned in the laboratory to regular academic tasks, we discovered that many of these young people already knew and used some of these skills (e.g., "executive strategies") in their daily lives. However, these students were typically unaware of their applicability to academic problems and, consequently, did not use them in school settings. In addition, then, to teaching them new skills and strategies, we turned to making the utility and application of such skills explicit. We bridged the two problem-solving situations and made explicit the applicability of these strategies, which they had learned and did apply in the indigenous situation, to the alien situation. Success in using something you already know from an "old" setting, to solve problems in a new setting, proved to be easier than learning what appeared to be new skills that were to be applied in a new (academic) setting. Good teachers for years have attempted to adapt learning experiences to the characteristics and circumstances of learners. Bloom's (1976) mastery learning, for example, does not simply require more time on task for those who require it, but introduces variations in methods of presentation to counteract boredom and more fully engage students. Even some of our misguided efforts at ability grouping are based upon the idea that different teaching strategies and pace are useful in the teaching of students who differ. Although the aptitude-treatment-interaction paradigm has failed to find support in much of the extant research, even Cronbach and Snow (1977) still find the paradigm appealing. It may well be that Messick (1976) is correct in suggesting that the problem with the absence of supportive research findings is related to the fact that many of us have been counting the score before we have learned to play the game. Cronbach and Snow provide an excellent critique of the technical problems in much of this research. Gordon (1988) has suggested, however, that the prevailing conception of the relationships in the paradigm may be misconceived. He has advanced the notion that it is not the direct interaction between learner characteristics and learning treatments that produce learning outcomes, but that learner characteristics interact with learning treatments to produce learner behaviors (time

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

on task, task engagement, energy deployment, and so on) and that it is these learner behaviors that account for learning outcomes. Without appropriate learner behaviors, achievement is not likely to occur even in the presence of an appropriate match between learner characteristics and learning treatments.

Diversity, pluralism, contextualism and perspectivism

Concern with the cultural backgrounds out of which learners come forces us to give attention in education to such philosophical constructs as diversity, pluralism, contextualism, and perspectivism. Each of these notions has its conventional meaning, but in education each has special significance. Attention to diversity requires that differences that adhere to individuals and groups be factored into the design and delivery of teaching and learning transactions. We have discussed some of these implications above under adaptability and complementarity. Attention to diversity in schools is often reflected in the individualization or at least the customizing of education relative to individuals' idiosyncratic characteristics.

Pluralism, which is often used as if it were synonymous with diversity, actually refers to the increasing demand that learners develop multiple competencies, some of which will apply generally while others will be more applicable to idiosyncratic settings. All of us find ourselves increasingly in situations where we must meet other than indigenous standards. Thus it is required that we become multi-lingual, multi-cultural, multi-skilled, and capable of functioning in multiple environments and settings. So, while education is influenced by and must be responsive to the differences with which learners enter the educational system, the exit characteristics of its students must reflect the pluralistic demands of the society in which they must live.

In a similar manner, education must be sensitive to variations in the contexts from which students come and in which schooling occurs. Here, values and belief systems provide important examples. Engagement in schooling and effectiveness of learning seem to proceed best when there is congruence between the home context and the school context, when the values of the community are not contradicted by the values of the school. Concern for parent involvement in the school is often misplaced on actual presence or participation in school activities. However, we are increasingly persuaded that the critical variable is not participation, but the absence of dissonance between home and school. Where there is support for common values, participation on the part of parents may be a bi-product.

Nevertheless, while participation is desirable, it is neither necessary nor sufficient, whereas contextual complimentarity, or congruence, is both.

Context refers to environment, surrounds, conditions, situations, and circumstances; context specificity, however, cannot be permitted to preclude the school's attention to perspective. In our concern for perspective we recognize that diverse characteristics and contexts are associated with differences in world views. People who live their lives differently are likely to have different perspectives on things. However, it is dysfunctional for education if students are not able to see the world from the perspectives of persons and peoples who differ from themselves. Cultural variation in populations is associated with people with different characteristics, who come from different contexts, and who may have different perspectives. These differences may place them at-risk of school failure if education does not function effectively to build upon these differences to enable pluralistic competencies and the capacity for multi-perspectivist thought and problem-solving. Especially for children who are placed at-risk of failure, by virtue of their differences from those children schools find it easy to serve, respectful concern for diversity, pluralism, context, and perspective must be at the heart of educational planning and service. However, in the final analysis it may be improvements in their conditions of life and their access to power and appropriate resources that are the prior requirements for their wholesome development.

References

Bloom, B.S. (1976). Human Characteristics and School Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cole, M., Gay, J., Glick, J., and Sharp, D.W. (1971). The Cultural Context of Learning and Thinking. NY: Basic Books.

Coleman, J et al. (1966). Equalization of Educational Opportunity. Washington: US Government Printing Office.

Collins, R.A. and Hanson, M.K. (1991, January). "Summative Evaluation Report, School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making Project 1987-88 through 1989-90." Miami: Dade County Public Schools Office of Educational Accountability.

Cronbach, L.J. and Snow R.E. (1977). Aptitudes and Instructional Methods. New York: Wiley.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). "Standards of Practice for Learner-Centered Schools." Prepared for NY State's "Standards for Excellence" Project, NCREST at Teachers College.

Geertz, C. (1973). Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gordon, E.T. (1992, March). "Subaltern Culture and Assessment." Presentation of unpublished paper at African American Adolescent Males Seminar, San Diego.

Gordon, E.W. (1988). Human Diversity and Pedagogy. Center in Research on Education, Culture, and Ethnicity Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

Gordon, E.W. (1986). Foundations for Academic Excellence. NYC Chancellor's Commission on Minimum Standards, NYC Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY.

Gordon, E.W. and Song, L.D. (1992, January) "Variations in the Experience of Resilience." For the Conference on Resilience, Temple University Center for Research on Human Development and Education Philadelphia.

Gordon, E.W., Rollock, D. and Miller, F. (1990). "Coping

with Communicentric Bias in Knowledge Production in the Social Sciences." Educational Researcher, 19, 19.

Gordon, E.W. (1991, Spring). Report of Consultant Panel: Mid-Course Review of Project Canal, Chicago Public Schools. Gordon and Gordon Associates, Pomona, NY.

Gordon, E.W. and Shipman, S. (1979). "Human Diversity, Pedagogy and Educational Equity" American Psychologist, 14, 10.

Greenough, W.T., Black, J.E. and Wallace, C.S. (1987). "Experience and Brain Development," Child Development, 58, 539-559.

Hebb, D. (1949). The Organization of Behavior: A Neuropsychological Theory. New York: Wiley.

Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

Messick, S. and Associates. (1976). Individuality and Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. National Education Goals Panel's Handbook for Local Goals Reports, "Building a Community of Learners." A publication of The National Educational Goals Panel, Washington, D.C., May, 1992.

Miller, Scott L. (1995). Academic Excellence, Current Achievement Patterns and The Changing Demographics of The Public Schools. New Haven: Yale. (In Process)

Ogbu, J. (1978). Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross Cultural Perspective. NY: Academic Press.

Rawls, J. (1971). A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Rosehan, D.L. (1967). Cultural Deprivation and Learning: An Examination for Learning. In H.L. Miller (Ed.) Education for the Disadvantaged pp 38-42. NY: Free Press.
Students at risk in at risk Schools: Improving Environments for Learning. (1992). Eds.: Hersholt C., Waxman, de Felix, J.W., Anderson, J.E., and Baptiste, H.P. Jr. California: Corwin Press Inc., A Sage Publications Company.

Tyler, R.W. (1949). Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in Society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wang, M.C. and Gordon, E.W. (1994). (Eds.), Educational resilience in inner-city America: Challenges and prospects. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wong, K.K. and Wang M.C. (1994). Rethinking Policy for At-Risk Students. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Chairman OWENS. Mr. McPartland.

Mr. MCPARTLAND. It is an honor to appear before this subcommittee which was so instrumental in the recent landmark legislation that redesigned the Federal research and development infrastructure for education. The entire educational research community is deeply indebted to you, Chairman Owens, and this subcommittee for your outstanding leadership in bringing about a new era when research and development can play a much stronger role in improving the Nation's schools.

I will comment on how the reauthorization of the OERI, particularly through its new National Institute on Education of At-Risk Youth offers great hope for establishing more effective schools for the Nation's poor and minority students. I will briefly list five new directions that can greatly benefit from the work of OERI's new national institutes.

Number one, the talent development model. The Nation is moving to a new image of the schooling process. Instead of a sorting paradigm that seeks to classify different types of students and trap them into alternative learning experiences, we can look forward to a talent development conception of schools. That offers the same opportunity to learn a demanding curriculum to all students and provides the classroom learning experiences that enable every one of them to be successful.

We can be gratified to now see a strong movement to such a common core curriculum of high standards for all students as the National education policy being widely supported by State and local officials. Yet there are critical research and development issues that need to be studied to guarantee the talent development model implied by this policy is successful. We must be worried by studies of past efforts to introduce new requirements and standards that show that too often they are undermined by implementations that allow for many exceptions, usually the students that are poor and minority, or permit watered-down alternatives for such students.

Research and development is needed to address the following questions: How can school and classroom resources be enhanced or reallocated in new more flexible ways to ensure that students who may begin behind and need extra help or assistance to reach the high standards will get the help they need? And how can the detracked classroom work well to capitalized on our diversed mix of students by providing appropriate incentives to learn and rewards to progress for each individual?

Number two theme, building on student strengths, new learning activities are emerging in America's classrooms that motivate student interest and encourage higher order learning because they build on the strengths and interests that students bring with them to schools. This new pedagogy can be of particular value to poor and minority students which schools seek to connect with the cultural heritages of different groups and to view linguistic and cultural diversity as an asset for new learning activities. Basic research from the OERI institute is also needed to identify those cultural traditions and home socialization experiences of different race and ethnic groups that can be translated into motivating classroom experiences.

Number three, supporting positive teacher and student roles and relationships. It takes more than a well-equipped building and outstanding curriculum to make effective schools. Schools must also be human communities of learners in which teachers and students share a strong common goal of talent development and each assume appropriate responsibilities to ensure individual success.

We are now on the threshold of important research and development that shows how desirable climates and positive relationships can be fostered in each and every school. Promising ideas need to be scientifically pursued. Ideas such as the use of teacher teams with adult mentors, incentives for individual student growth and improvement and assessment methods that encourage the teacher's role as a coach rather than an evaluator and a student's role as a responsible learner that takes initiative for their own learning.

Number four, scaling up proven practices for widespread use. When scientific evaluations establish the effectiveness of new school and classroom approaches for teaching all students, we need reliable ways to provide these proven approaches to interested schools throughout the Nation.

Scaling up proven educational practices has become now a major issue because we do have a number of practical examples that meet this proven description. We need to learn when and how to apply different dissemination and technical assistance approaches such as network of users using the same innovations, regionally and local technical assistance agencies and professional development sequences among cooperating schools.

And number five, evaluation of reforms. We need to regularly employ the rigorous scientific tools of research experiments and evaluation to make steady progress in expanding the catalog of things we now have that could be called effective classroom and school programs for all students. Unfortunately it is still unusual when any of the numerous promising ideas for classroom or school reform are actually supposed to scientific evaluations to show if positive effects can be directly and statistically attributed to the innovation. OERI's new institute should prove the impetus for putting science truly in the service of school improvement action.

After those five comments, I want to make a plea which I am sure you support, Mr. Chairman, for adequate funding for the new OERI. The reauthorized OERI should provide a new era in which first grade federally supported research and development becomes a strong partner in reforming American education. But this requires adequate funding for OERI's new national initiatives. For example, the OERI institute on the education of at-risk is now very well positioned to launch important new research and development efforts. From the documents we have seen from Dr. Robinson's staff, it is clear the OERI leaders have a firm grasp on the key issues where education research and development is most needed and ready to pay off from this new institute.

The structure of focused institutes within OERI geared to move research into practice should give Congress the initial confidence that major increases in Federal support for such education R&D will indeed result in solutions to some of the most pressing problems in American education and, as time goes on, Congressional investments should grow further as the education research and de-

velopment community grasps these new opportunities to make advances on the key themes such as those I mentioned. Achieving the talent development, goal building on student strengths, supporting new teacher and student roles, scaling up proven practices, and scientifically evaluating education reforms.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of James M. McPartland follows:]

House Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights

Testimony of James M. McPartland, Johns Hopkins University
September 15, 1994

It is an honor to appear before this subcommittee which was so instrumental in the recent landmark legislation that redesigned the federal research and development infrastructure for education. The entire educational research community is deeply indebted to you and chairman Owens for your outstanding leadership in bringing about a new era when research and development can play a much stronger role in improving the nation's schools.

I currently serve as the Director of the OERI-sponsored Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students at Johns Hopkins University. From the vantage point of this Center's work over the past five years , I will comment on how the reauthorized OERI, with its new National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Youth, offers great hope for establishing more effective schools for the nation's poor and minority students. These are the students who most depend on having excellent schools but whose education has been seriously shortchanged in recent years.

Our Center has contributed to a number of recent comprehensive reviews of research on the risk factors encountered by many poor and minority students and the educational programs designed to best serve these students. These reviews identify an impressive foundation of scientific knowledge and demonstration project evaluations on which to build new major efforts of educational reform for students placed at risk (McPartland, 1993; McPartland and Slavin, 1990; Montgomery, et al., 1993; Natriello, McDill and Pallas, 1990; Rossi, 1994; Slavin, Karweit and Madden, 1989; Slavin, Karweit and Wasik, 1994).

There are several good reasons to expect major advances in the education of students placed at risk over the next few years. But each advance will require some

specific research and development assistance to fulfill its true promise. I will briefly list five new directions that can benefit greatly from the work of OERI's new National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Youth.

1. *The Talent Development Model*

The nation is moving to a new image of the schooling process. Instead of a sorting paradigm that seeks to classify different types of students and track them into alternative learning experiences, we can look forward to a talent development conception of schools that offers the same opportunity to learn a demanding curriculum to all students and provides the classroom learning experiences that enable every one of them to be successful.

The talent development framework is key for poor and minority students, who are most often the victims of the sorting process, as they are more likely to be placed in lower tracks that withhold the more challenging curriculum topics and the higher order learning activities. We can no longer afford to allow this large and growing segment of our students to fail to reach the high talent potential that resides within each one of them.

We can be gratified to now see a strong movement for a common core curriculum of high standards for all students as the national education policy being widely supported by state and local officials. Yet there are critical research and development issues that need to be studied to guarantee that the talent development model implied by this policy is successful. Studies of past efforts to introduce new requirements and standards show that too often they are undermined by implementations that allow too many exceptions or permit watered-down alternatives for poor and minority students. We need to find ways to establish high standards with support systems so all students can be successful (McPartland and Schneider, 1994).

Research and development is needed to address the following questions. How can school and classroom resources be enhanced and reallocated in new more flexible ways to insure that students who need extra time or assistance to reach the high standards get the help they need? How can the detracked classroom work well to capitalize on a diverse mix of students by providing appropriate incentives to learn and rewards for progress for each individual? What can be learned from emerging experiments on common core curriculum -- such as Algebra-for-All and the College Board's Equity 2000 -- about the staff development and resource allocation features to make the talent development model become a reality?

2. *Building upon student strengths*

New learning activities are emerging in America's classrooms that motivate student interest and encourage higher order learning because they build upon the strengths and interests which students bring with them to school. New learning tasks are being designed in each subject to actively involve students in meaningful and challenging projects. This new pedagogy can be of particular value to poor and minority students, if schools seek to connect with the cultural heritages of different groups and to view linguistic and cultural diversity as an asset for new learning activities. Thus, there is the promise of transforming classroom activities from the traditional passive lecture and recitation mode that concentrates on memorizing facts and formulas and is insensitive to cultural traditions, to a constructivist learning environment that encourages students to become actively involved in interesting higher order activities where they can build upon their own earlier experiences and cultural assets.

Research and development is needed from several of OERI's new Institutes to reach the goal of building upon student assets. Research and development specialists in each major subject need to design and evaluate new constructivist learning activities at each grade level, with strong support from the new Institute on Student Achievement, Assessment and Curriculum. Basic research from the Institute on At-Risk Youth is also

needed to identify the cultural traditions and home socialization experiences of different race and ethnic groups that can be translated into classroom experiences that motivate student interest and connect to familiar learning modes.

3. *Supporting positive teacher and student roles and relationships*

It takes more than well-equipped buildings and outstanding curriculum to make effective schools. Schools also must be human communities of learners in which teachers and students share a strong common goal of talent development and assume appropriate responsibilities to insure individual student success. But too often the human climate and relationships in American schools do not aim at high academic achievement for all or promote respect and positive concern between students and teachers.

Poor and minority students can be expected to benefit most from schools that develop more healthy human climates and more positive teacher-student relations. Their present schools are more often held down by low expectations, student alienation and unspoken conspiracies between teachers and students to permit poor achievement and mediocre effort. Recent research confirms that public and private schools that have strong academic climates and supportive teacher-student relations will pay the most dividends for the academic achievement of poor and minority students (Bryk, Lee, and Holland, 1993).

We are on the threshold of important research and development that shows how desirable climates and positive relationships can be fostered in every school. Work from OERI's new Institutes is needed on new staffing patterns and organizational arrangements to encourage effective human conditions in schools. Promising ideas need to be scientifically pursued -- ideas such as the use of teacher teams with adult mentors, incentives for growth and improvement, and assessment methods that encourage the teacher's role as a coach and the student's role as a responsible learner.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. *Scaling up proven practices for widespread use*

When scientific evaluations establish the effectiveness of new school and classroom approaches for teaching all students, we need reliable ways to provide these approaches to interested schools throughout the nation. Scaling up proven educational practices has become a major issue, because we now have a number of practical examples that meet this description, especially restructured elementary school instructional packages such as Reading Recovery and Success For All. The challenge is to find ways to disseminate such approaches that permit adoptions that meet local conditions while faithfully reproducing the essential elements that make each approach effective.

Poor and minority students should be given ready access to the most effective proven innovations because their needs are greatest. Financial support from Chapter 1 and other supplemental programs is available for funding these wise investments.

Research and development is needed from the new Institutes on Policy and on At-Risk Youth to address the scaling-up issue. We need to learn when and how to apply different dissemination and technical assistance approaches such as networks of users sharing the same innovations, regional and local technical assistance agencies, and professional development sequences among cooperating schools in the same district or across districts.

5. *Evaluation of reforms*

We need to more regularly employ the rigorous scientific tools of research experiments and evaluations to make steady progress in expanding the catalog of effective school and classroom programs for all students. It is still unusual when any of the numerous promising ideas for school or classroom reform are actually exposed to scientific evaluations to show if positive effects can be directly attributed to the innovation. As a consequence, the efforts at reforming American schools have been a series of fits and starts that do not sustain over time nor build to cumulative impacts.

87-192 O - 95 - 4

OERI's new Institutes should provide the impetus for putting science more often in the service of school improvements. Requiring careful designs and convincing measurements should be the standard conditions of OERI support. The new Institutes could also sponsor professional arrangements to address scientific disagreements or to synthesize results and implications of related research. The reauthorizing legislation is very consistent with OERI's role as a leader in scientific activities to improve education.

Adequate funding is needed for the new OERI

The reauthorized OERI should produce a new era in which first-rate federally supported research and development becomes a strong partner in reforming American education. But this requires adequate funding for OERI's new National Institutes.

For example, the OERI Institute on the Education of At-Risk Youth is now well positioned to launch important new research and development efforts. It is clear that OERI leaders have a firm grasp on the key issues where research and development is most needed from the new Institute on Students at Risk. The working documents prepared by OERI staff provide well-informed analyses of the specific kinds of research and development investments most likely to pay off in improving the educational outcomes for poor and minority learners. They focus attention on current specific research and development challenges at each stage of schooling for students placed at risk, with an understanding that different disciplines, methodologies, and partnerships are needed in a balance of basic and applied work to advance the overriding goal of successful schools for all students.

We now all need to convince Congress that adequate funding for important new research and development thrusts will be invested well by the reorganized OERI and its key Institutes, including the Institute on Students At Risk. The new structure of focused Institutes within an OERI geared to move research into practice should give Congress

initial confidence that major increases in federal support for educational R and D will result in solutions to some of the most pressing problems in American education. As time goes on, Congressional investments will grow further as the educational research and development community grasps these new opportunities to make advances on key themes such as those I mentioned -- achieving the talent development goal, building on student strengths, supporting new teacher and student roles, scaling up proven practices, and scientifically evaluating educational reforms.

References

Boykin, A.W. (1994). Harvesting talent and culture: African-American children and educational reform. Pp. 116-138 in R.J. Rossi (Ed.) *Schools and students at risk*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bryk, A.S., Lee, V.E. and Holland, P.B. (1993). *Catholic schools and the common good*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McPartland, J.M. and Schneider, B. (1994). Opportunities to learn and student diversity: Prospects and pitfalls of a common core curriculum. Paper prepared for OERI Conference on Sociology and Public Policy in Education, Washington, DC.

McPartland, J. (1993). A conceptual framework on learning environments and student motivation for language minority and other underserved populations. *Proceedings of the Third National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues*. Washington, DC: Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, U.S. Department of Education.

McPartland, J.M. and Slavin, R.E. (1990). *Increasing achievement of at-risk students at each level (Policy Perspectives Series)*. Washington, DC: Information Services, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Montgomery, A. et al. (1993). *Educational reforms and students at-risk*. Washington, DC: Office of Research, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Natriello, G., McDill, E.L. and Pallas, A.M. (1990). *Schooling disadvantaged children: Racing against catastrophe*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rossi, R.J. (Ed.) (1994). *Schools and students at risk*. New York: Teacher College Press.

Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., and Madden, N.A. (1989). *Effective programs for students at risk*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., and Wasik, B.A. (1994). *Preventing early school failure*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chairman OWENS. Dr. Walker.

Ms. WALKER. Good morning. And I would like to say what a privilege it is for me to speak to you at this time of great change in OERI.

I work at a regional education laboratory, one of 10 laboratories around the country funded by OERI, but I also come to you today as a citizen of Chicago, as a person who serves as the President of the Chicago Algebra Project Community Board in Chicago, and to let you know that although I work in educational research and development, I am not an education researcher and I do not speak to you today on behalf of researchers. I speak to you today as a consumer, a user of research, both professionally and as a parent and advocate for the reform of public education in Chicago and across the Nation.

My advocacy today is to ask us to shift the focus of R&D so that local schools and communities are its principal customers and clients and shift it in a way that accountability falls on the R&D system to serve this local school and community client.

Out of all we know about educating children from poor urban communities, one thing is certain: Getting different outcomes is highly dependent on the capacity of the individual school to support and sustain innovative, effective programs. Research evidence doesn't falter on this point.

Because I know then that the greatest bang for our R&D dollar is at the local school level, I believe that we have an ethical imperative to guarantee that local schools and the people who work in them and with them are moved to the front of the client list for educational research and development. On the face of it, this may seem easy to accomplish, but it is not. Making change at the local school level is enormously complex. Numerous constraints exist.

First, the consequences for not educating poor inner-city children have increased exponentially. Let me tell you about four students from the Van Vlissingen School, one of 24 schools implementing the Algebra Project in Chicago. Last week Robert Sandifer, 11 years old, allegedly killed Shavon Dean who was 14. Later that week, two boys, one 14, the other 16, allegedly killed Robert to keep him from turning in fellow gang members.

All four of these children either were or had been enrolled at Van Vlissingen School. Shavon, an eighth grade graduate last spring, was an Algebra Project student. Robert, had he entered school this fall, would have been an Algebra Project student in the sixth grade. These two deaths are a sobering reminder.

For schools like Van Vlissingen, changes in curriculum and instruction are almost meaningless unless we solve broader problems across the whole community fabric. Unfortunately before schools can even fully confront the academic problems of children like Robert, we often lose them to abuse, neglect, drugs, crime, and violence. It is little wonder, then, that school reform is not reaching the screens of many urban communities, particularly at the neighborhood level. Yet the one bond shared by these children, besides violence, is the Van Vlissingen School and the Algebra Project. It is not an insignificant bond.

A second constraint at the local school level is the difficulty of holding on to a vision for change. Even when the school reform

does manage to capture the hearts and minds of local people, as it is now in Chicago with local school councils made up of parents, neighborhood residents, teachers and principals, change can too easily get bogged down.

This quagmire poses some pressing questions I believe for educational R&D. How do we break down bureaucratic gridlock so that local schools get the attention they need? How do we promote self-questioning, inquiry, renewal and reflection, all characteristics we would ask of any other innovative high-performance institution? And how do we help schools stop collecting programs like Christmas tree ornaments and instead make informed program selections based on the needs of the students they serve? I have heard assistant Secretary Robinson, who is the lead witness today, say more than once if we don't, the process we will keep getting the same outcomes.

Part of this change, I believe, involves accepting some new values about the nature of R&D work, the first of which is that it be authentic and real work. That is the authenticity must be lodged in the experiences and knowledge of its customers and clients, those who are working for reform at the local school and community level. On the face of this, this, too, may sound self-evident, but it is not because R&D has a time-honored tradition of being driven by academic expertise and top down policy initiatives. Authenticity thus represents a substantial pivot.

A second value I believe we could change about how we do R&D is that it must aim at goals that have been co-developed with the client community. An important aspect of co-development is something I call demand. When people bring their own energy to a task, it creates a demand. Bob Moses taught me about demand from his work in Mississippi in the 1960s. He talks about how everyone assumed that blacks were apathetic because they didn't vote in Mississippi, but Bob describes how the minute the sharecroppers took their collective energy and demanded the right to vote, the game was over. Demand turns out to be a substantial element, I believe, in the school reform environment. We don't have enough demand coming from the ground up for the kind of outcomes that we want with children.

A third change in values would hold educational R&D accountable for negotiating the gap between top and bottom, that is making sure that all stakeholders are involved in all aspects of the work. I think research and development activities would then be guided by a different set of standards. We would ask about local energies and multiple voices. We ask does it focus on need, not just what is available in the research pool. And we would ask does this work hold itself accountable to government and policymakers in the same way that it holds itself accountable to families, local schools, and communities. What difference might these values that I propose make in research in development? I would like to describe three examples from work currently going inside the regional lab system that I think speak to these values in a particular way.

The first is the Algebra Project, a national mathematics program for the middle school that was developed by civil rights activist Bob Moses. Bob identified algebra as a gatekeeper subject, one that could make or break a kid's high school career and determine his

or her eligibility for college entrance and for higher math and science studies.

In Chicago the failure rate for high school algebra students is about 50 percent. At that point, we immediately cut down a major gateway for many, many students. Moses uses in this program the experience of the kids such as a ride on the subway to teach students critical algebra concepts. Moreover Bob uses organizing techniques from his days in Mississippi to spread the Algebra Project to other parts in the country, always entering a new community through its parent and community organizations, including schools.

Several years ago three labs, the North Central Lab in Illinois, SERVE in the deep South, and Far West Lab began working with Moses and his staff and assisting communities with support and dissemination of the Algebra Project curriculum. The Algebra Project in the Mississippi Delta is even working in 12 rural school districts to use electronic communications, technologies that are remote and underequipped in terms of their use of these kinds of technologies. This use has been a direct collaboration with schools and local communities and these regional labs. This kind of collaboration I believe shows how the Federal R&D dollar can be matched with grassroots resources and real R&D energies that are going on out in the field to scaffold projects' approaches, strategies that are emerging in the field and providing a scaffold for them so that R&D happens not just in universities, not just in regional labs, but it happens in real communities.

A second example I would like to tell you about comes from my lab's experiences with urban schools in the Midwest. Some of the best successes we have experienced as a laboratory have happened where we have built a partnership with local educators. One of the larger such partnerships we now have is in Detroit, where NCREL presented our strategic teaching and reading project to teachers in schools at a staff development fair. We were invited in to train teachers at 11 elementary and middle schools. That was in 1991. We basically came with a set of research principles about reading, about learning to read, and about teaching students to take responsibility for their own learning. These were the ideas that Detroit schools bought into: Ideas about how learning happens.

In the space of three years, the program has expanded to 30 schools in Detroit, and we are no longer providing the primary training for this program. Teachers who are our first-generation trainees are now training additional lead teachers in Detroit. And the central office of the Detroit public schools has built strategic reading into its internal support system so the resources are there for any school that wants in.

This is an organic process. It is authentic. It is based on needs that people in Detroit brought to the table. And the materials we use were co-developed with the field and are constantly being adapted and enriched by teacher practice and action research. David Kibby, the curriculum director for Detroit schools, says the staff development model inherent in this project that utilizes local experts to be the leaders of change is perhaps the project's greatest strength.

A last story comes from again the North Central Lab and our attempts to overcome the difficulty of doing outreach and getting re-

search materials out to the field. In our region we have a mere 18,000 public schools. Many of them are located in 13 major urban centers. A lot of our energy goes into producing print, audio and video materials that make research easily accessible to classroom teachers and principals.

As we speak today, NCREL is in the midst of launching a public-private venture to publish CITYSCHOOLS, a brand-new magazine of research for urban parents and educators. It will focus on up-to-date research on such topics as resiliency, the research that helps us understand why some kids make it and others don't. Our aim is to give voice to teachers and community leaders who are engaged in reshaping schools to tell their experiences right alongside the work of distinguished university researchers. The first issue will feature the work of Linda Winfield who has been an important researcher in the area of resiliency. To the best of my knowledge, this new magazine, CITYSCHOOLS, will be the first such magazine to combine these audiences.

Let me say in summation as we enter a new era of leadership and a new set of tasks under the Office of Education Research and Improvement, I would like to urge you to consider the four recommendations that I would like to put on the table. Before I came here, I went all around Chicago last week saying to people, I am going to be testifying, tell me what you want me to say, tell me what you think would be important to bring to Washington as a message regarding our interests in educational research and development concerning those of us who are on the front lines as parents, as community members, and as teachers in schools.

The first thing we would like to request is that more powerful incentives be provided for the R&D system to pay attention to local schools and communities. We believe these incentives must include a resource pool that local schools and communities can access. For those of us who work in R&D, our hearts are often in the right place, but those without real resources have a difficult time sometimes influencing what we do. Perhaps a portion of the Federal R&D budget could be set aside to fund local R&D projects that get generated from the ground up in much the same way that the National Science Foundation has done with its urban systemic initiative.

You have no idea how much internal collaboration among schools, parents, teachers that program has driven on the ground. We have been fighting a lot, but we also have been collaborating a lot. A second recommendation is that incentives be provided for educational and R&D to connect to broader issues of family and community development.

There have been some experiments over the last couple of years with connecting the R&D agendas of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education, for example. We could use more experiments like it and more importantly, these experiments could be grounded in real communities who are allowed to generate not only the issues and how they should be examined, but the products that get developed as well.

As long as local communities are more worried about safety, violence, housing, drugs, gangs, and jobs than they are about education, they will not turn their attention to schools and education

reform. Ironically education reform is the most effective strategy we have for front-end prevention of these other problems.

My third recommendation is that we take some of the risks out of Federal R&D agencies working with process, that is the kind of activities that generate local energy, that help build consensus, and that facilitate problem solving across stakeholder groups. Too often we are leery of seeing process outcomes as real products, yet labs are often in the position of serving as a bridge between educational constituent groups.

We are often the only ones who are talking to a local school council president in Chicago and the chief State school officer in of Illinois at the same time. We have the capacity to generate conversation and to get action out of that conversation. We can and should be able to build critical relationships and count them as the products of R&D.

My last recommendation is that we provide opportunities for local communities, teachers, parents, community residents, to pull up a seat at the R&D policy table. Let their authentic needs and interests drive a larger part of the research and development agenda. Let them make decisions about what the subjects of research ought to be.

At the national and State levels, there are powerful forums available for discourse and planning around education reform. All of us who work in education reform at this level attend these forums every day, every month, every year. These opportunities for conversation and input need to be replicated for local people in schools and community-based institutions. They need to be able to talk to one another as well as with other potential constituents whom they might engage in their work.

Thank you for this opportunity, your time, and your attention.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Beverly J. Walker follows:]

B.J. Walker
Deputy Director
North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

Good Morning. My name is B.J. Walker. I work at the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, one of OERI's 10 regional laboratories around the country. I also live in Chicago and serve as President of the Chicago Algebra Project community board. Although I work in educational research and development, I am not an education researcher and I do not speak to you today on behalf of researchers. I speak to you today as a consumer, a user, of research, both professionally and as an advocate for the reform of public education in Chicago and across the nation.

What I hope to do is represent the voices of multiple school and community-based stakeholders, to talk about what role federally-sponsored research and development can and should play in generating change for children and youth attending high poverty urban schools.

My advocacy today is to challenge us to consider ways to shift the focus of R&D so that local schools and communities are its principal clients, and shift it in a way that accountability falls on the R&D system to serve this local school and community client.

Out of all that we know about educating children from poor urban communities, one thing is certain: getting different outcomes is highly dependent on the capacity of the individual school to support and sustain innovative, effective programs. Research evidence doesn't falter on this point.

Because I know that the greatest bang for our R & D dollar is at the local school level, I believe that we have an ethical imperative to guarantee that local schools and the people who work in them, and with them, are moved to the front of the client list for educational research and development.

On the face of it, this may seem relatively easy to accomplish, but it is not. Making change at the local school level is enormously complex. Numerous constraints exist.

First, the consequences for not educating poor, inner city children have increased exponentially. Let me tell you about four students from the Van Vlissingen School, one of 24 schools implementing the Algebra Project in Chicago. Last week, Robert Sandifer, 11 years old, allegedly killed Shavon Dean, who was 14. Later that week, two boys, one 14, the other 16, allegedly killed Robert to keep him from turning in fellow gang members.

All four of these children either were or had been enrolled at the Van Vlissingen school. Shavon, an 8th grade graduate last spring, was an Algebra Project student. Robert, had he entered school this fall, would have been an Algebra Project student. These two deaths are a sobering reminder: For schools like Van Vlissingen, changes in curriculum and instruction are almost meaningless unless we solve broader problems across the whole community fabric. These are the kinds of consequences we now face in urban high poverty schools. Unfortunately, before schools can even fully confront the academic problems of children like Robert, we often lose them to abuse, neglect, drugs, crime, and violence. It's little wonder, then, that school reform is not reaching the screens of many urban communities, particularly at the neighborhood level. Yet the one bond shared by these children, besides violence, is the Van Vlissingen School and the Algebra Project. It is not an insignificant bond.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A second constraint facing local schools is the difficulty of holding onto a vision for change. Even when school reform does capture the hearts and minds of local people, as it is now in Chicago with our local school councils, made up of parents, neighborhood residents, teachers, and principals who run each school, change can too easily get bogged down. This quagmire poses some pressing questions for educational R&D. How do we break down bureaucratic gridlock so that local schools get attention to their needs? How do we overcome the paralyzing burnout and loss of energy at the local school level? How do we reverse low expectations and lack of professional drive? How do we promote self-questioning, inquiry, renewal, and reflection -- all characteristics we would ask of any other innovative, high-performance institution? How do we help schools stop collecting programs like Xmas tree ornaments and, instead, make informed program selections based on the needs of the students they actually serve?

I've heard Sharon Robinson, who is the Lead Witness today, say more than once: If we don't change the process, we'll keep getting the same outcomes.

Part of this change, I believe, involves accepting some new values about the nature of R&D work, the first of which is that it be authentic and real work. That is, the authenticity must be lodged in the experiences and knowledge of its clients: those who are working for reform at the local school and community level. On the face of it, this may sound self-evident but it is not, because R&D has a time-honored tradition of being driven by academic expertise and top-down policy initiatives. Authenticity thus represents a substantial pivot.

A second value is that federally sponsored R&D must aim at goals that have been co-developed with the client community. An important aspect of co-development is something I call demand. When people bring their own energy to a task, it creates a demand. Bob Moses taught me about demand from his work in Mississippi in the 1960's. He talks about how everyone assumed that blacks were apathetic because they did not vote. But Bob describes how the minute those sharecroppers took their collective energy and demanded the right the vote, the game was over.

A third change in values would hold educational R&D accountable for negotiating the gap between top and bottom, that is, involving all stakeholders in all aspects of the work. Research and development activities would then be evaluated by a different set of standards: Does it tap into local energies and listen to multiple voices? Does it focus on need, not just what's available in the research pool? Does it work both inside and outside schools? Does it hold itself accountable to government and policymakers, on one hand, and families, local schools, and communities, on the other? Does it remove the artificial and immobilizing boundaries between "fixers" and those who need fixes?

What difference might these values make in research and development? I'd like to describe examples from work currently going on inside the regional laboratory system.

THE FIRST is the Algebra Project, a national mathematics program for the middle school, developed by civil rights activist Bob Moses, who is also a mathematician. Moses identified algebra as a "gatekeeper" subject, that is, one which can make or break a kid's high school career, determine his eligibility for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

college entrance, or for higher math and science studies. In Chicago, the failure rate for high school Algebra I students is about fifty percent.

Moses worked with students and teachers at the schools attended by his own children in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to develop an early bridge between arithmetic and algebra, and to lay a stronger foundation for success in high school math. He uses everyday experience of kids, such as a ride on the subway, to teach students critical algebraic concepts, thus easing their transition to higher level math. Moreover, Bob uses organizing techniques from his days in the Freedom Movement in Mississippi to spread the Algebra Project idea to other parts of the country, always entering a new community through its parent and community organizations, including schools.

Several years ago, three labs--NCREL, SERVE in the deep South and Far West Lab -- began working with Moses and his staff, and assisting communities with support and dissemination of the Algebra Project curriculum. The Algebra Project is even working in 12 rural school districts in the Mississippi Delta, where the use of electronic communications technology has made possible networking of Algebra Project schools in even the most remote and under equipped schools. This has been the direct result of lab collaboration with schools and local communities where a demand for new strategies has arisen. The 3 Labs have leveraged local efforts by providing funds and services for teacher training, technical support, evaluation and technology.

This lab/Algebra Project collaboration shows how the federal R&D dollar can be matched with grassroots resources and energies to make significant changes in high poverty schools.

THE SECOND example comes from my lab's experiences working with urban schools in the midwest. The best successes we've experienced as a laboratory have happened where we've built a partnership with local educators. What we're pursuing is school/lab collaborations to turn schools around, achievement-wise. One of the largest such partnerships is in Detroit, where NCREL presented our Strategic Teaching and Reading Project at a systemwide Staff Development Fair for educators searching for promising research based models.

This led to our being invited in to train teachers at 11 elementary and middle schools. That was in 1991. The project initially proved popular in part, because, it did not necessitate throwing away the teaching materials schools already had purchased, nor did it require schools to buy costly peripherals. We basically came in with a set of research-based principles about reading, about learning to read, and about teaching students to take responsibility for their own learning. These were the ideas that schools bought into: ideas about how learning happens.

In the space of 3 years, the program has expanded to 30 schools, and NCREL is no longer providing the training--teachers who were our first generation trainees are now training additional lead teachers. The central office of the Detroit Public Schools has built Strategic Reading into its internal support system so the resources are there for any school that wants in. It's an organic process, and the materials we use were co-developed with the field and are constantly being adapted and enriched by teacher practice and action.

research. Teachers have really noticed the change. A teacher told us recently that "evidence that new strategies are being tried is being found in the daily lesson plans of teachers." And Dr. David Kibby, curriculum director for the Detroit schools, says: "The staff development model inherent in [this project], that utilizes local "experts" to be the leaders of change is perhaps the project's greatest strength."

We believe that this kind of action research which involves local schools as partners opens multiple pathways for the emergence of new leadership at the local school level.

THE THIRD story comes from our attempts as a lab to overcome the difficulty of doing outreach and getting research materials out to the field. In NCREL's service region we have a mere 18,000 public schools, many of them in 13 major urban centers. Therefore, much of our energy goes into developing print, audio and video products that can make research easily accessible to these educators.

As we speak today, NCREL is in the midst of launching a public-private venture to publish CITYSCHOOLS, a brand-new magazine of research for urban parents and educators. CITYSCHOOLS will focus on the most up-to-date research on such topics as resiliency--the research that helps us understand why some kids "make it" and others don't. Our aim is to give voice to teachers and community leaders who are engaged in reshaping urban schools, to tell their experiences right alongside the work of distinguished university researchers, who are known for their work in urban schools. To the best of my knowledge, CITYSCHOOLS will be the first such magazine to combine these audiences.

Today, I have tried to make three principal points about educational R&D:

The first is that its goal should be helping people at the local school level get things done. R&D should therefore be action-oriented because the local school is where we most need solutions. From research on effective school change, we know that practitioners along with parents and community activists are the most potentially powerful clients R&D can have. But they must be active clients, not passive recipients.

The second is that engaging parents, community members, and practitioners as active consumers of R&D will require that those of us working in R&D take on some new values, values that help us balance our use of expert knowledge with a healthy respect for the authentic, everyday experiences and knowledge of people in local schools and communities.

The third is that some of us out here are already actively involved in making these R&D goals come true, as professionals and as community-based education activists. What we need is support and advocacy.

IN SUMMATION. As we enter a new era of leadership and a new set of tasks under the Office of Education Research and Improvement, I urge you to consider the following:

1) **Provide more powerful incentives for the R&D system to pay attention to local schools and communities.** These incentives must include a resource pool that local schools and communities can access. For those of us who work in R&D--our hearts are often in the right place--but those without

resources have a difficult time influencing what we do. Perhaps a portion of the federal R&D budget could be set aside to fund local R&D projects, that get generated from the ground up, in much the same way that the National Science Foundation has done with its urban systemic initiative. You have no idea how much internal collaboration that program has driven on the ground, among teachers, schools, and community organizations. In another example, a group of Chicago community organizers have been working for two years on a proposal to establish a Community Learning Institute, a community based R&D strategy that would study and develop processes for promoting and sustaining community learning, across all ages. These kind of activities can force new questions and investigations throughout the federal R&D world.

2) **Provide incentives for educational R & D to connect to broader issues of family and community development.** There have been some experiments with connecting the R&D agendas of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education, for example. We could use more experiments like it, and more importantly, those experiments could be grounded in real communities, who are allowed to generate not only the issues and how they should be examined, but the products they develop as well. As long as local communities are more worried about safety, violence, housing, drugs, gangs, and jobs than they are about education, they will not turn their attention to schools and education reform--ironically, one of the most effective strategies we have for front end prevention of these other problems.

3) **Take some of the risks out of R&D agencies working with process (that is, activities that generate local energy; that help build consensus; and that facilitate problem solving across stakeholder groups).** Too often, we are leery of seeing process outcomes as real products. Yet, labs are often in the position of serving as a bridge between educational constituent groups. We can and should be able to build critical relationships and count them as the products of R&D.

4) **Build a set of concrete outcomes for the R&D system that recognizes both government and policymakers as well as families and local communities as clients.** I'd like to see more opportunities for labs to help build and facilitate the capacities of local communities to ask their own research questions and conduct the data collection and analysis tasks associated with those questions.

5) **Provide incentives for co-development, not one-way product development and dissemination.** There is a tremendous amount of untapped energy and knowledge lodged in local schools and communities. This local energy and knowledge must be farmed back into the R&D process.

6) **Provide opportunities for local communities--teachers, principals, and community residents--to pull up a seat at the R&D policy table.** Let their authentic needs and interests drive a larger part of the research and development agenda. Let them make decisions about what the subjects of research ought to be. At the national and state levels, there are powerful forums available for discourse and planning around education reform. These opportunities for conversation and input need to be replicated for local folk, in schools and community based institutions; they need to be able to talk to one another, as well as with other potential constituents whom they might engage in their work.

I thank you for your time and your attention.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chairman OWENS. We will begin with the sense of urgency that Dr. Walker communicates.

Dr. Gordon, at the end of your testimony, I want to explain I made a comment about Congressmen need answers in two years and Senators in six years. You were talking about persistence and continuity, and I appreciate that and certainly think whatever research is done should be done thoroughly with the highest professional standards, but there is a pressure on us. The voters these days are demanding answers and we have to demand answers, and any institution that is funded by the government is going to pressure them to produce some answers, so how do you reach a golden mean between the two extremes where, as a politician, I am pushing for answers as fast as possible and, as a researcher, you know what you can't do, but what you have to do under certain methods, you call it mission orientation.

My mission orientation will be a problem and could be very partisan and political. I know the dangers of that on the one hand. On the other hand, I would like to set some priorities, and that is I think part of what Dr. Walker is talking about, setting priorities, she wants community people and local people to set priorities and expect some responses from researchers. Certainly on a national level we can say there are problems that are occurring in inner-city communities all across the country that have the same problems, that have the same quest for an answer, and I wondered if the priority setting process, you know, can't bend to that push for practical answers that is out there.

Mr. GORDON. Congressman, I introduced these issues in the context of the kind of tension that we need to be sensitive to and respectful of. I share your concern with the urgency. I have been at this business now for 50 years.

I am 73 and hope before I turn in my chips, that I can see more progress than we have made, so I want to see some answers, and I think that one of the things that we do is to push these new centers to urgently and with all delivery of speed move to attack urgent practical problems.

However, the other piece of it is to understand that some of these problems are so intractable that they are going to take time. A colleague who works with me has just completed a little piece in which he talks about intergenerational strategies for addressing the problems of minority education. And what he is calling attention to there is the relationship between intergenerational memberships say in the middle class and certain of the achievement patterns that we associate with that middle class.

Now, some people in my shop are struggling to see how you can leapfrog the development of minority kids so that we don't have to go through that intergenerational process. But at the same time, some others of us are trying to study that intergenerational process because if that is really essential, then it is important that we understand it and we facilitate that, whereas, if we put all of our efforts now in the leapfrog strategies, we may end up not solving the problem if it is unsolvable with that.

My basic argument was not that we choose between these two, but that we be sensitive to the tension between the two and try to respect both ends of it.

Chairman OWENS. Dr. McPartland and Dr. Walker, if I were to say that I think the institute for the education of at-risk students ought to immediately get on this problem and give us some answers as soon as possible, what is the role of multi-cultural education or student-centric education, Afrocentric, Italian-centric, Hispanic-centric?

We have enough controversies going on for the last 20 some years about motivation and the necessity to motivate students and how their sense of self-worth and self-esteem would be improved if they have curriculum items that really relate to them and their heritage. It is about time we got some answers I say. Is that priority setting or is that mission driven, irrational mission driving?

Mr. MCPARTLAND. I think you are putting your finger on one of the most promising areas in student motivation, I should say that I have a colleague at Howard University, Wade Boigen, who would say it is more than just curriculum, getting figures and references into the textbooks, it really has to do with cultural integrity in a much broader sense.

He has some very interesting experimental work with African-American youth that the learning environment itself can relate to a cultural heritage, things like cooperative learning, things like morality as a mode of instruction, things like multimedia activities that he identifies with cultural traditions that aren't now respected and built upon in schools, so I think it is not only the curriculum content areas that respect histories and heritages and so on, there really is a much broader aspect of cultural that differentiates one group from another that we haven't capitalized on, and I think building on his kind of experimental work and others, we can do much better and it is absolutely necessary.

If we want kids not to be bored and see no relevance in what they do, we have to connect with them in every way possible and that includes in a very strong way with what they bring with them to the school in terms of their own experiences and cultural backgrounds.

Chairman OWENS. I want answers to give to my constituents, and I want to be able to cite authorities that cannot be challenged. Some people want to go into court and demand curriculum changes and they want authorities that can be cited.

We have many examples and many people who will come and testify, but there is an absence of some kind of authoritative statement from institutions that really back it up and make it impossible for boards of education to continue to waffle.

This is something that does not cost a lot of money. It does not require large appropriations yet it goes on and on as a problem. We cannot get the curriculum to reflect the desire, great desire, overwhelming desire of the parents and community to have cultural heritage reflected as part of the curriculum.

Dr. Walker.

Ms. WALKER. The way I usually deal with this in thinking about it is that multi-cultural education, to my mind the bottom-line question of it really has to do with what good learning is and good learning theory is that kids learn best when they connect new knowledge to prior knowledge. And prior knowledge is almost al-

ways grounded in culture, language, how you do things around your house, in your neighborhood, and where you come from.

And in my mind, I think that sometimes we can solve this problem, this political problem of multi-culturalism by rephrasing it as another problem. If we talk about learning theory and prior knowledge and about the importance of using prior knowledge in learning and deemphasize the issue of multi-cultural because multi-cultural is only a reflection of a good learning theory, I think that there is a lot of ways to get around the issue of having political fights and battles over the multi-cultural question.

I think back when I was a kid in school, we had a curriculum, oftentimes in segregated schools, that was multi-cultural in the sense that it was cultural. It went into our cultural roots but it did that to teach us better, I think, and I think we have to rephrase how we talk about this and phrase it in a way that people can understand prior knowledge, and in that you are connecting new knowledge to prior knowledge, and that prior knowledge is based on a number of things, it is what you have already learned, but it is all of these other issues as well.

Ms. WALKER. Then we have to let communities fight the political battle over the cultural issue, the multicultural issue for themselves. I don't think we can fight this battle from a top-down issue. I think it has to be fought by local communities, parents, and people in local schools.

Chairman OWENS. Fighting the battle is somebody else's job, politicians and other folks. But to have in our arsenal some authoritative statements about self-esteem and self-motivation and the role of connecting with your own people, your own heritage as you move to master a set of knowledge, also a connection to the mainstream, that is what I am talking about having——

Ms. WALKER. I agree.

Chairman OWENS. [continuing] authority behind you.

Ms. WALKER. I think there is a lot of authority out there, that people who have grounded their work in multiculturalism around good learning have provided good authority around the issue of these—the importance of these issues. There are those, those people like Jeff Howard and others who have done work that—he doesn't call his work multicultural, but the efficacy concept is certainly only meant to talk about self-esteem, having power over your own learning, taking that power and using the resources that come to you from your culture and language.

I think there is all kinds of authority out there that buttresses the need for kids to come from where they are. I think it needs to be brought to the surface, though. I think communities need to have access to it and know that it is there and understand how to use it.

Chairman OWENS. There is authority out there but, you know, on the one hand, you have people who advocate one position, on the other hand you have Arthur Schlesinger and Diane Radovich advocate another.

Is it reasonable to say that at the Institute for the Education of At-Risk Students to give us something in a few years that we can settle the argument with so we can have a clear, scientifically

grounded basis for settling the argument once and for all? Is that unreasonable?

Ms. WALKER. I don't think so.

Chairman OWENS. You talked about co-development of goals, stakeholders helping to set priorities. Do you two gentlemen think that that is possible, that that is a reasonable achievement at the local level to have it fit back up the chain?

You used my favorite example, the county agents in the Department of Agriculture programs, you had to flow straight down from the theorists and the researchers to the experimentations, agricultural experimental stations, then you had the county agent who actually took it out to the farmers. I suppose the farmers would often say, hey, we don't need this right now. We got a problem over here with boll weevils. Go back and bring us some answers about how to deal with boll weevils.

In education can we have a system which can really become effective if we react and respond to that kind of on-the-ground front line?

Mr. MCPARTLAND. Well, I think that the whole dissemination of innovations, the idea is to somehow get together the possibility for local adaptations so people buy in and make it their own by adapting to the local conditions and circumstances that they only know, but, at the same time, holding the validity of the improvement so that it is not watered down and changed and loses its impact.

That is the neat trick, to somehow have proven practices available for local use in such a way that they can be adapted and made their own by the local users. And I think part of it is planning from the beginning, but also somehow to have some flexibility in these innovations so that they can be used community-by-community.

I also think the whole idea of how to do professional development in a way that is not—that is a continuing aid to teachers on the line that want to try new things, that they have the support, not just the kind of hit-and-run show exposure, but some continuing support in trying new things.

Detracking is a wonderful example. Teachers need support in how to make use of a mixed class, just doing away with tracking is going to be undermined in the long run unless we support teachers with professional development assistance that allows them to take the detracking innovation and live with it in their own terms and in everyday classroom situations. So how to keep the change valid at the same time to allow the local situation—the local users to put their own piece on it is—is, I think, the trick.

Chairman OWENS. Dr. Walker, I read about the Bob Moses Algebra Project. It was on the front page of The New York Times magazine, I think, once. To see a civil rights hero who is on the firing line now, front line in education, was very inspiring.

The dissemination of that approach, you talked about it. It is escalating at the regional level. Would you say that something that has been as successful as that makes as much sense as that does should be spread out in far more widespread use throughout the country?

Ms. WALKER. I would not only say that, but I would also say that I think it is important that innovations like it are able to generate real R&D questions that then turn around and generate data, eval-

uative information that we can use to turn back into the project and to help it begin to do even a better job.

I mean, one of the challenges we have is that as you work in local schools with the Algebra Project, questions begin to emerge about staff development, about how you connect the values of that project to the values of other instruction and curriculum that teachers are using, and answers begin to come out of that. And it is very difficult to both implement the project, make sure it has some successful outcomes as a project, and then capture those learnings and make them available, not only for the project, but available to others and to other things.

So I think there is a tremendous opportunity for R&D to pick up these kinds of innovations that have been out there that have been struggling to—may have an existence in the field and that because they don't have an R&D buck attached to them, they don't have the opportunity to do the kind of R&D work that any innovation in this country we would use in any other area would certainly get and need in order to make itself better. So I think there is a dissemination issue, but there is also a key critical R&D question here.

Chairman OWENS. Your laboratory and the other laboratories that picked up on spreading the Bob Moses approach ought to be congratulated. But you are part of the Federal systems.

Ms. WALKER. Right.

Chairman OWENS. The laboratories, what are the impediments for it moving up into the system so that Washington here, way out here in Washington will get it and then it will be spread throughout the rest of the country in a more rapid way? Is there a need for some power to be in the hands of those at the laboratory level or is this just an oversight? What do you think is the problem?

Ms. WALKER. Well, I think there is two ways. Lots of times—and I don't see this just as an impediment from the OERI end. I think it is an impediment from our own end.

We interpret the RFP for the laboratory system sometimes, I think, too narrowly. We don't have the kind of values sometimes to bring to that process that I suggest are values we should have that allows us to then think of the Algebra Project in a big way as a—as an approach or strategy that gets at some aspect of the RFP process. So that is one piece, I think.

The second piece is that I think this thing about values and what our traditional values about R&D are is—turns out to be difficult to overcome, and so that projects that are basically field-grounded, teacher-based, community-based don't turn out to get as much visibility in the R&D world as some of the more traditional research approaches.

I mean, I, for one, believe in traditional research. I mean basic research. I think there is a tremendous need for it, but I think that R&D needs to be broader and needs to think of itself in a very broader way. I mean, someone in Chicago told me, said would you tell them that it ought to be a little "r" and a big "D." I don't know how my colleagues would say that. People on the street say a little "r" and a big "D."

The development problem is the one we have a hard time dealing with. We know how to do research. We know the processes of research. I am not sure we have done as good a job understanding

what is the role of development and how we connect that process to the ground in some substantive way. Those are two challenges. I am sure there are others. Those are the two that I see.

Mr. GORDON. May I comment?

Chairman OWENS. I cut you off before. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I think that this discussion suggests another area of work for the center. The fact is that Bob Moses' model has been picked up more broadly than we may be aware. There is a project that the entire college entrance board now coordinates using that model, and I think it is in seven school districts around the country, it does have the evaluation, research and development component.

Chairman OWENS. You say seven?

Mr. GORDON. Seven. That particular project, the college boards project, is in seven entire school districts across the country. And last time I looked at it, there were three additional districts that independently are doing this.

That would seem to me that one of the things that the center might want to be doing is looking at these, if you want to call them natural experiments and studying them and disseminating the product of the work from them.

When you cut me off, which you were apologizing for, which is quite all right, I was simply going to extend your agricultural agent example one further step. I have been looking at the literature on that effort, and one of the interesting things in the development of the agricultural extension agent program, in its beginning, the agents did take the knowledge from the research centers in their packages out to farmers and handed it to them and they discovered that that didn't work.

And what they began to do in a subsequent and more successful period was to go out to farmers, talk to farmers about the problems they were having and then applying the knowledge of the university to those problems that farmers had. And I think this is the model that we are now talking about.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. Just one last question for the three of you, and that is on the personnel pool question. Is there a personnel pool adequate for this task? If we have an expansion now, we are about to have the center funded for $27 million over a five-year period and the institute following that.

Just in the area of at-risk students and dealing with the problem of at-risk students, do we have a sufficient number of personnel available who are sensitive to the task and work from both ends in terms of the practical problems as well as the solutions?

Mr. GORDON. The answer to that one, from my perspective, depends on how you define that pool. If you define it narrowly in terms of traditionally prepared researchers, the likelihood is that there are enough people technically prepared, but probably not enough people contexturally and attitudinally prepared, and that reflects the shortage of minority folk.

Chairman OWENS. The attitude is very important.

Mr. GORDON. Absolutely. And I use the term "context," people who are familiar with and sensitive to the context in which these problems have got to be worked out.

If you insist now that that pool be limited to the people who have the traditional Ph.D.-type training and you want that broader sensitivity, we might have difficulty finding enough such people, although I think that we could mount a major effort with what we have got, and I was earlier complimenting the department on having corraled a critical mass of such people.

However, when one begins to think about the kinds of talent that are needed for this work and begin to recognize—I referred to it, different kinds of intelligence, different kinds of competence, a person's understanding of the social relationships between people and understanding that is borne of life experience that has been reflected upon may be as important to this work as the students that I have trained at Yale, traditional kinds of research.

When one begins to think of these different kinds of competencies that are really needed and the variety of people out there that have them, I think we have got more than enough people. What we have got to change is the criteria that we use for selecting them.

Mr. MCPARTLAND. I strongly agree that we could use very well—Congress could invest many more dollars into this and even the particular amounts that are now being invested. Take this particular center, for example. There should be a center on language diversity and all the issues of bilingual education by itself. The enormous problems of that.

Our Native American and rural populations are amongst the poor and disadvantaged. I mean, students at-risk must include those groups. At every grade level, the problems are distinctively different because human development is at a different stage. The youngsters and toddlers need a particular set of learning experiences. Elementary grades, we heard from a colleague, Congressman Scott about the middle and high school grades. There are vast problems.

This is just a drop in the bucket of the investments that should be made, the new institute and the new center. It should be many times that and many times that soon. And there is no question that the talent to the resources, the resources are way under their level of talent, scientific, both basic and applied scholarship that is available there, including Latino and African-American scholars, many times the availability of talent than the resources now available. We should be doubling and tripling the amount, even though this is a wonderful start and should pay off, it is nowhere near what the Federal investment should be given the talent and the problem.

Chairman OWENS. Doctor.

Ms. WALKER. I am worried about the personnel pool. I am worried not just because what I see around me at the present time, but I am worried because I look in the high schools and I look in the colleges, and I look for those who may come through and join this pool. So I am worried on that score.

I am also worried, as Dr. Gordon was saying, about the sort of attitudinal and contextural issues. There are many, many fine scholars out there who have very good scholarly skills, but the sensitivity, and every day I deal with educational research and researchers, and the sensitivity to where the implications of their

work might go are very difficult and it is—and many times it is a battle to work with some scholars on some of those kinds of issues.

I would like to see some sort of Federal investment in generating more young scholars. I think we could use and to diverting more people from current work into scholarship. I think there are many opportunities for people to leave a particular field that they are working in now and perhaps segue into scholarship and to the ability to do some of the work that we know needs doing so.

I think we have every reason to worry about the personnel pool and that the fact that we have enough dollars in the pool will never compensate for our ability to generate those young people and those older people who will have an adequate frame of reference to come to this work and a commitment to having this work—to having this work be done on behalf of children who are most in need of the kind of knowledge we are trying to generate.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. I want to thank all three of you and hope that you can stay with us for another 30 minutes at least. We have at this hearing an innovation. We would like to invite members of the audience now who were not invited to submit testimony, written testimony, but they might have some comments or questions.

We appreciate it if you could remain with us and respond to some questions that they may have or some comments that they make. I invite any member of the audience who would like to join us in this quest to try to get a start-up of the institution for the study—institution for the education of at-risk students, the start-up of a new OERI, to get it launched with as much practical input as possible, as much wisdom we might have.

So if you have a comment, we welcome you to take the mike at the table to introduce yourself. This is recorded on the official record. Your comments will be as much—or you can take the mike here. Your comments will be as much on record as any others.

Ms. COTTMAN. Thank you, Representative Owens. I am Roberta Cottman from Wayne State University, Detroit. I would like to comment, first of all, that I am not speaking on behalf of the driven academic expertise which has really driven education and in education. I am not speaking on behalf of our minority graduate students who find it very difficult to do their research in clinical projects around our African-American—particularly our African-American communities.

I am speaking on behalf of those of us in the urban community, Detroit, and Dr. Walker spoke very strongly in that, in regards to being at the table, legislatively as well as educationally in our cities in being at the table when the institutes are being formed.

I speak from Detroit that the new institute for disadvantaged youth, the third one at-risk, Detroit public schools, is being located in the new center area of Detroit, a block from General Motors, right across the street from Channel 56, which is our public broadcasting system, a block from the new center mall with Crowley's and Gitano's. And what did the community say when the school was to be proposed? There goes the neighborhood. Those young people will bring crime. It will not be a safe area.

We need help now in seeing that this institute, our Detroit institute, gets the kind of financial support. But most of all, how to

build the urban community for its involvement with a recognition of that involvement. We need to look at new curricula and innovative. You mentioned several times this morning the importance of self-esteem.

Joycelyn Elders spoke this morning to us and said if you cannot have a healthy child, how can you possibly expect them to learn? If they are not educated, how can you possibly expect them to keep a healthy body? We are saying that the curricula for all of our children, not just the at-risk, must give a scientific rationale for keeping my body healthy and I do not risk it.

From my cultural roots, I have a body that needs recognition. It is me. And that is not taught, either in the health profession schools or in our curricula. We—hypertension is still the greatest risk factor for African-American males, and we don't say how old they are, young and adult. Science and health go together.

I am saying have a science and health project like the Algebra Project. I am saying also legislatively that we must collaborate with what is happening. What about the educational components and the prevention components of the crime bill which were just passed? Communities need to know how to tap in that.

Communities also need to know how to tap into teasing our young people into new vocations, and that is the Minority Health Improvement Act, which is before Congress today. Everybody does not need to be a Joycelyn Elders, M.D., health workers, the health industry is one of the greatest economic aspects in our community. Why not tease our young people into health careers? So I am saying across the board, education, practice, health belong together.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. Regent Sanford, you may sit, if you wish. A mike is available.

Ms. SANFORD. I will.

Chairman OWENS. Regent Sanford.

Ms. SANFORD. Thank you, Congressman Owens.

I would like to ask, if possible, if possible it is our concern that the educational agenda and the practices in education be based on substantive research. If there would be some way that the institute for at-risk children could define the kind of background kind of expertise and the kind of interest that the people who contribute to this debate have in the area of at-risk students.

Now, I am saying that because it seems to me that in the last, I would say, three or four years, maybe five years, when the issues of curriculum revision, multiculturalism, at-risk students comes before the public, it very often comes through the prism of the Arthur Schlesingers, of the Diane Radoviches, the Al Shankers. And these, it appears to me from my knowledge of their background, are not people who have had any successful experience with working with at-risk children. It is totally outside of their domain of expertise. And I think that they get the level of attention that they get because they are able to get their articles and their voices in main media.

But if the at-risk institute established the kind of background experience and expertise that is necessary to have your voice considered in making policy, I think it would be very helpful. We certainly cannot quiet these voices, but we can declare them irrelevant to the argument. We want to have our interaction with those peo-

ple who have been successful with this population. And I submit that many of the voices that are the loudest have made no contribution to the issues of at-risk children, nor have they even said that it is a factor that they would like to in some way address.

My other question——

Chairman OWENS. Would certification be a bad word, certification?

Ms. SANFORD. I beg your pardon?

Chairman OWENS. Certification or decertification.

Ms. SANFORD. Minimally I say the voices are there, but they are really not relevant. I certainly would not go to a hospital that had never done any kind of surgery or medication with a particular disease that I have and go there and accept their advice.

But this is really what we have done in educational arenas. We have allowed these voices to drown out the voices of the Howard Gardners of the regional laboratories that have done such marvelous—we know less about that than we know about the naysayers. And I feel concerned about that as a member of the board of regents.

I feel that the research that we heard about today, both from Detroit and from the regional lab and even from Johns Hopkins, even State boards don't have this information. We are inundated with the opinions of the Radoviches and the Schlesingers and the Al Shankers and the George Wills, but we don't get this data.

So I am wondering if there is any way that the data that comes out of these institutes is generated to policymakers in a regular formalized way so that we can benefit from it.

Finally, I wonder if there could be some training arranged for policymakers all across this Nation, people who are on State boards of education, as well as people who are on local boards, do not have a centralized place where they can come to prepare them for making the kind of policies that relate to children at risk that they need to make.

So we have a proliferation of many people who are devising policy based on their very limited background, their very limited exposure. And in a world like the one we live in in the United States of America where ethnic groups and racial groups do not co-mingle in positive relationships, you have people who have had negative relationships in positions of making policy for people that are called at-risk, and that is extremely dangerous and extremely damaging.

We have not provided enough information for them to have another basis for making that policy. So I am hoping that one of the things that the institute might make possible would be the preparation and the sharing of this research data. I don't want to say training. That sounds as though I think they need to be trained. I think that experiencially and contexturally, they just don't have the information that they need to make the kinds of policies that would really benefit our children. There are people on these boards who really believe that at-risk children are at-risk genetically and there is really nothing you can do about it, and they are making policy for these children.

Thank you so much.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

There is a parallel institute for governance and management which will be addressing itself to boards and policymakers and education across the board. Certainly the Institution for the Education of At-Risk students should relate to those particular problems that people who are in positions where they are making decisions about at-risk children would have an opportunity to have support from and data and—if not training, certainly some kind of counseling.

Ms. SANFORD. May I pursue that a little further? Because I think the availability is one thing. But if the funds are going to be accessed by these people, then there should be some requirement for the information that goes with the funds.

I can recall when Title I and Chapter 1 first came into the schools, I was a teacher at that time. And everyone was very excited about accessing the money. But there was no effort made to determine if the people who received the money believed in the children for whom the money would be used.

So you had, similar to Brown versus the Topeka Board of Education, you have desegregation plans put in the hands of segregationists. You have funds for children who are at risk, but the funds are put in the hands of people who don't have the expertise but they want the money. It is from that pot that they can hire.

I am saying there needs to be some requirement for exposure to the conceptual design and the major philosophical premise upon which this money is granted; specifically that all children can learn at high levels when taught. There are many people who have in no way embraced that concept.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. My name is John Smith. I am most interested——

Chairman OWENS. Say a little more about yourself for the record.

Mr. SMITH. I don't know what more you want me to say. My name is John Smith. I live in Montgomery County, Maryland. I am former staff member of the House Committee on Education and Labor. I don't think I need to say any more than that.

There is a new publication from the U.S. Department of Education. It is called A Teacher's Guide to the U.S. Department of Education. And in that publication, it provides all kinds of resources relative to the programs and the institutions that are supported by the Department.

There is a entry in here concerning the National research and development centers, and it says that these centers are to help improve and strengthen student learning in the United States. The Office of Research supports 23 university-based national education research and development centers.

The centers address specific topics, such as early childhood education, student achievement in core academic subjects and teacher training—teacher preparation and training. And then I find this next sentence most interesting. In addition, most of the centers also focus on the education of disadvantaged students.

Now, I may be wrong, but of the 23 centers, not one of these centers is located—now, they are all university-based. Not one of these centers that I can identify is an historically black college or university. None of these centers are HBCU's.

And I guess my question is, my fear is that in the awarding of this $27 million, five-year award to the National Research and De-

velopment Center, I am concerned about who is going to get this money. I don't—I don't—I would hazard a guess and say that if you talk to the Department of Education, they would say, well, this is a competitive process and the best institutions that have the greatest credibility and the greatest experience and so forth and so on, that is how these—that is how these institutions competitively win the awards.

Now, I guess my question, my question is, how can it be that of these 23 centers that focus—it says most of the centers also focus on the education of disadvantaged children. Why is it that there is not a FAMU, Florida A&M University that is part of this matrix? How come Morehouse is not part of this matrix? How come Howard University is not part of this matrix?

You talked about educating disadvantaged youngsters. We know that the HBCU's are the most successful at educating youngsters from the African-American community. Congressman Owens, you asked about the pool. And my question would be how do you develop a pool of expertise if the institutions that are most successful at educating African-American students do not participate in this—in this grouping of universities with centers located at their institutions? That is my question.

Chairman OWENS. It is a question that we have been wrestling with for the last 12 years. And I am sure many others wrestled with it before. And the slow process of institutional change has been amazing.

However, I am happy to report that the competition for the Center for At-Risk Students, the Office of Education Research and Improvement require that there be some kind of demonstrated past experience, and in many cases, the applicants have paired themselves, if they are not historically black colleges and universities, they are paired with or in consortium with an historically black-educated college or university.

This is a very good comparison. They have very good competitors, and the probability that the award winner will be very qualified in this area of sensitivity and experience with at-risk students is great, greater than ever before.

Thank you.

Yes.

Ms. FOX. My may is Nia Fox. I am a senior at UCLA right now. I am one of the at-risk students that you all are speaking of. I was, at least. I attended school both in the Chicago area, the Hyde Park Academy and LA Manual Arts, which is a predominantly Latino school.

I am interning here now to try to get some kind of basis. I am 20 years old and I am here to speak on my half of my peers. I don't have a question. I more have comments or rather things that I would like to say.

I would like to see more students here speaking on this issue or to get more feedback from the students on what they would like to see done or just to hear their voice within this forum and within a larger forum so that we can understand more what the students feel need to be done.

Personally, from my own experience, within the—both of the schools that I attended, we had such a tracking system where you

would have honor students, magnet students and then, you know, higher honor students, and then you would have the average students.

And most of the people that I knew, not—if not all of them, were interested in attending higher education, were interested in attending, getting a better education later on in life. Most of them did not have access to it within the schools because the schools would not give them certain courses that they needed in order to go to college, in order to prepare for higher education.

Had I personally not done it myself, I would have been in the same position a lot of my friends are in where we took home economics courses or courses that taught us how to write, fill out checks in a checkbook. Well, if you can't get a job later on in life, you are not going to have a checking account to write out a check anyway.

So I had plenty of friends, myself included, who would get good grades in school, but didn't have the proper courses that would take us out of the at-risk status. And so you have such a large number of students who we, quote-unquote, call at-risk who are trying to do so much better, but who don't have the—within their own schools, within their own institutions do not have it accessible for them to receive the proper education because they are so tracked and they are told, well, no, you cannot get into this course because you are not smart enough to get in this—into this course. You don't have the—enough drive to get into a particular courses. So I am just here on behalf of those students and to make their voice a little bit heard here.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you very much.

I think Dr. Walker mentioned how algebra is one of those gateway courses you have to take in order to go on. We recognize that it is a major problem, that the destiny of youngsters are being determined very early in their careers as a result of these lack of opportunities to take the gateway courses. Yes. You are next.

Ms. LETT SIMMONS. Oh. I thought the gentleman preceded me.

Mr. MAYBERRY. I yield.

Chairman OWENS. I am sorry. I didn't see you.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Mr. Chairman, my name is Claude Mayberry. I am the President of Science Weekly, Incorporated. I planned not to say anything, but I think this is one issue that I think has been left out of all the testimony today. And I would like to piggyback a little bit on what Dr. Sanford was saying in terms of having some training for people, sensitivity training for people who are—and policymakers. It is a question of integrity and the question of ethics has not been raised this morning in the testimony.

I think one of the things that we see is really left behind in terms of educational research, that is the question of integrity and the question of ethics. We saw in this country for a decade where ethics was left and actually were put out of our schools, our higher schools of education, particularly in the field of law.

And I think we are still facing the consequences of that being removed from law schools as a required course for students. I think we need to move back and at least put on record that we do—there is a need for it.

When we talk about education research and particularly the implementation of that research that integrity and ethics is placed back into that process. We know there is a void there, and I know from my long experience in traveling the country the kind of research going on in this country on at-risk students. Integrity and ethics is not there. When people can receive money for research and know there is not enough money to carry out and achieve the goals that the proposals say they are going achieve, I know there is no sincere effort going to be made to bring about change, but they have the money brought into those institutions, they carry on research and to bring on more staff, they carry on the operations of those institutions, that is all, because I think the question of ethics and the question of integrity is not in the forefront.

And I would just like to be on the record as saying we need to include in our testimony on education research, particularly for these new centers that are coming forward, that the people who receive that money is going to use that monies for research and development, that integrity and ethics is part of that.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you very much.

A long-standing problem is they want the money. They want it as fast as possible. Those who have the greatest skills usually get the money have been the ones who least cared about what the outcome and the results would be.

Yes.

Ms. LETT SIMMONS. Congressman Owens, it is always a pleasure. It is kind of where I get my new charge to go on the next year, by coming here and hearing these fine people—I thought your three presenters today were magnificent. I especially liked the down-to-earth reality that was evidenced in terms of each of their three presentations so that we in the lay community and in our cities respectively can go home and give some of this charge and juice to the people back there.

When John raises that obvious question, it is a paradox to say that we have special kinds of programs with special focus and yet not any of it, not any of it grounded in a school that has its origin and its heritage from that aegis. We have got to stop playing the games of doing words and giving lip service.

This lady here, I want to know, will these questions be printed? Can we get those disseminated across? Because they need to be answered. I think they are good questions. They merit attention, real serious attention. And I would hope that these—these experts that you have brought here would have an opportunity to have a swing at those and see—they don't have to be charged with the responsibility of what has happened. They can just be purists in terms of academicians, scholars, people with integrity and knowledge and not have to worry about the political ramifications to answer a question like John Smith raises here. It has to do with an embedded sexist, racist, classist society, and it so permeates everything that these things happen and we act like we don't quite know how they happen.

They happen because they aren't people, as Dr. Gordon said, who have a conceptual, contextural, attitudinal inbreeding of anything other than those three powerful beliefs that operate in our Nation—racism, sexism, and classism. So we got to stop acting like we

don't see, that we don't know how these decisions get made and how these things still happen, because we do, and we have got to be willing to say if it walks like a duck, it must be a duck. And I just—I just come here every year, get new knowledge, new information and new anger, okay, and I think some other folks do, too.

Chairman OWENS. I think you will have to identify yourself so we know who the strong language came from for the record. A lot of people don't know you. For the record, what is your name?

Ms. LETT SIMMONS. I am sorry, Congressman. My name is Barbara Lett Simmons. I am so many things that I have been both called—not called. I want you to know the most significant who I am is I have cared and worked for young people in terms of education in general and black ones in particular for some 43 years.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you very much. Miss Lett Simmons is our last speaker. We appreciate all of the participation today, especially panelists, some of whom have come from quite a long way. I think Dr. Gordon took the red eye from California today to be with us.

Thank you very much and we look forward to working with you. There may be additional questions we will have as we progress in the start-up of these very important programs.

The subcommittee hearing is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:50 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

87-192 (112)

ISBN 0-16-046655-5